



ASSESSMENT OF DEVELOPMENT RESULTS **GUYANA**

EVALUATION OF UNDP CONTRIBUTION



HUMAN DEVELOPMENT effectiveness COORDINATION AND PARTNERSHIP
efficiency COORDINATION AND PARTNERSHIP sus
NATIONAL OWNERSHIP relevance MANAGING FO
sustainability MANAGING FOR RESULTS responsiveness
AN DEVELOPMENT responsiveness NATIONAL OW
NATIONAL OWNERSHIP effectiveness COORDINATION
efficiency COORDINATION AND PARTNERSHIP sus
NATIONAL OWNERSHIP relevance MANAGING FO
sustainability MANAGING FOR RESULTS responsiveness
HUMAN DEVELOPMENT effectiveness COORDINATION



ASSESSMENT OF DEVELOPMENT RESULTS **GUYANA**
EVALUATION OF UNDP CONTRIBUTION

REPORTS PUBLISHED UNDER THE ADR SERIES

Afghanistan	Egypt	Nigeria
Argentina	Ethiopia	Philippines
Bangladesh	Georgia	Peru
Barbados	Guatemala	Rwanda
Benin	Guyana	Serbia
Bhutan	Honduras	Seychelles
Bosnia & Herzegovina	India	Sudan
Botswana	Indonesia	Syrian Arab Republic
Bulgaria	Jamaica	Tajikistan
Burkina Faso	Jordan	Turkey
Cambodia	Lao PDR	Uganda
Chile	Libya	Ukraine
China	Maldives	Uzbekistan
Colombia	Montenegro	Viet Nam
Republic of the Congo	Mozambique	Yemen
Ecuador	Nicaragua	Zambia

EVALUATION TEAM

Team Leader	Anne Gillies
Team Members	Virginia Ravndal Perry Mars
Evaluation Office Task Manager	Azusa Kubota
Research Assistant	Zembaba Ayalew

ASSESSMENT OF DEVELOPMENT RESULTS: GUYANA

Copyright © UNDP 2010, all rights reserved.
Manufactured in the United States of America. Printed on recycled paper.

The analysis and recommendations of this report do not necessarily reflect the views of the United Nations Development Programme, its Executive Board or the United Nations Member States. This is an independent publication by UNDP Evaluation Office.

Cover photographs provided by UNDP Guyana.

Copy editing: Denise M. Doig
Graphic design: Laurie Douglas Graphic Design (www.lauriedouglas.com)
Printing: Consolidated Graphics

FOREWORD

This is an independent country-level evaluation called the Assessment of Development Results (ADR) conducted in Guyana by the Evaluation Office of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). This evaluation examined the relevance and strategic positioning of UNDP support and its contributions to the country's development from 2001 to 2010. It assessed UNDP Guyana's interventions under the four thematic areas of the country programme (poverty reduction, democratic governance, environment and energy, and disaster recovery and risk reduction), with an intention to provide forward-looking recommendations that are useful for the formulation of the new UNDP country programme in Guyana. The ADR process benefited from a participatory stakeholder workshop held in April 2010 in Guyana. The workshop was attended by approximately 60 national participants, including key senior government officials and high-level representatives from civil society, political parties, the UN system and bilateral donors.

During the period under evaluation, Guyana has graduated from the Heavily Indebted Poor Countries status and has now become a lower-middle income country. Despite progress made, Guyana continues to face challenges of out-migration of educated people, poverty and uneven levels of human development among its people. Guyana also experienced pressing needs due to the devastating floods of 2005 and the 2006 elections. UNDP Guyana responded to these emerging needs well, while supporting long-term development priorities within the framework of the key national development strategies notably the National Development Strategy and the Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper. The ADR identified challenges with programme management such as delayed project implementation, weak monitoring and evaluation and inadequate sizes of interventions to ensure lasting change,

but some of these challenges are being addressed under leadership of the country office.

The ADR highlighted a number of issues and challenges that are shared by UNDP country offices in middle-income countries. In order to continue to be relevant and effective, UNDP needs to define its strategic niche and constantly change its role in a fast evolving environment. To support the country's transition to a middle-income status, the ADR recommends UNDP Guyana continue to reorient and shift its programming towards higher-level policy analysis and advice from community-level investments. National stakeholders expressed their endorsement of this recommendation based on the strengths of UNDP in Guyana and the country's priorities. The ADR also reminded UNDP of the importance in maintaining a fine balance between Guyana's short-term emergency needs and long-term development needs. UNDP Guyana has quickly mobilized resources to attend to the country's emerging priorities, but this was done, at times, at the expense of meeting long-term development support outlined in the programme documents. As external assistance for development activities from traditional development partners continues to reduce, there is a need for UNDP to stay focused on issues where it has comparative advantage and help Guyana explore alternative sources of support through South-South, regional and public-private partnerships. It is my sincere hope that this ADR has provided UNDP Guyana, UNDP globally and national partners with an opportunity to reflect on the role of UNDP in Guyana and other emerging middle-income countries.

A number of people contributed to this evaluation. First and foremost, I would like to thank the independent evaluation team, led by Anne Gillies, and its members, Virginia Ravndal and Perry Mars. I thank the external reviewers of the draft

report, Dennis Ben, professor at the University of the West Indies, and Fuat Andic, independent consultant, as well as research assistant Zembaba Ayalew. My sincere gratitude is extended to all the people in Guyana: the Government of Guyana, political parties, civil society, the international development community, the UN family, the private sector, local authorities and members of the communities where the ADR team visited during the evaluation mission.

The evaluation would not have been possible without the support provided by colleagues in UNDP Guyana: Resident Representative Kiari Liman-Tinguiri, Deputy Resident Representative Didier Trebucq, and the ADR focal persons including Patsy Ross, Amaly Kowlessar, Nadine Livan and Kenroy Roach. All other programme, project and operations staff provided the ADR

team with invaluable support. I would also like to thank the UNDP Regional Bureau for Latin America and the Caribbean, especially Senior Programme Advisor Carla Khammar for supporting the ADR process, participating in the stakeholder workshop and representing the regional bureau's commitment to the evaluation follow-up. Finally, let me thank our colleagues in the Evaluation Office: Azusa Kubota, task manager of this evaluation, as well as Oscar Garcia, Fabrizio Felloni, Michael Reynolds, Thuy Hang To, Michelle Sy, and Anish Pradhan for their support.



Saraswathi Menon
Director, Evaluation Office

CONTENTS

Acronyms and Abbreviations	vii
Executive Summary	ix
Chapter 1. Introduction	1
1.1 Objective and scope of the ADR	1
1.2 Methodology	3
1.3 Structure of the report	4
Chapter 2. Development Challenges and National Strategies	7
2.1 National development priorities	7
2.2 Role of external assistance	12
Chapter 3. UNDP Response and Strategies	15
3.1 UN and UNDP roles in Guyana	15
3.2 UNDP development approach	17
Chapter 4. UNDP Contributions to Development Results	23
4.1 Effectiveness	32
4.2 Efficiency	34
4.3 Sustainability	30
4.4 Country programme management	34
Chapter 5. Strategic Positioning of UNDP	41
5.1 Strategic relevance	41
5.2 Responsiveness	43
5.3 Strategic partnerships	44
5.4 Contribution to UN values	46
5.5 Contribution to UN coordination	48
Chapter 6. Conclusions and Recommendations	51
6.1 Conclusions	51
6.2 Recommendations	57
Annexes	
Annex 1. ADR Terms of Reference	61
Annex 2. Evaluation Framework	69
Annex 3. Results Overview for the UNDP Guyana Country Programme 2001-2008	85
Annex 4. List of Individuals Consulted	89
Annex 5. List of Documents Consulted	95

Tables

Table 1.	Evaluation Criteria and Key Questions	1
Table 2.	Key Economic and Social Indicators for Guyana, 2000/2001 and 2006/2007	8
Table 3.	ODA Flows to Guyana 2001-2007	13
Table 4.	Major International Donors to Guyana 2001-2007	13
Table 5.	Thematic Areas and National Development Partners for UNDP in Guyana	18
Table 6.	Results Overview for Guyana Country Programme	18
Table 7.	Annual Programme Expenditures for UNDP Guyana 2004-2008	21
Table 8.	Estimated Total Project Expenditures by Thematic Area for UNDP Guyana 2001-2008	21
Table 9.	Thematic Area Expenditures by UNDP Guyana 2004-2007	21
Table 10.	UNDP Guyana Balanced Scorecard Report Summary 2004-2007	35

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

ADR	Assessment of Development Results
AIDS	acquired immune deficiency syndrome
AWP	Annual Work Plan
BCPR	Bureau for Conflict Prevention and Recovery (UNDP)
CARICOM	Caribbean Community
CCA	Common Country Assessment
CCF	Country Cooperation Framework
CDB	Caribbean Development Bank
CDC	Civil Defence Commission
CDERA	Caribbean Disaster and Emergency Response Agency
CIDA	Canadian International Development Agency
CPAP	Country Programme Action Plan
CPD	Country Programme Document
CREDP	Caribbean Renewable Energy Development Programme
CSME	Caribbean Single Market Economy
DEX	direct execution
DFID	Department for International Development (United Kingdom)
DISSC	Development of Institutional Social Statistics Capacity
EPA	Environmental Protection Agency
EPTSI	Enhance Public Trust, Security and Inclusion
EU	European Union
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
FTI	Fast Track Initiative
GECOM	Guyana Elections Commission
GEF	Global Environment Facility
GoG	Government of Guyana
GSI	Guiana Shield Initiative
HIPC	Heavily Indebted Poor Countries
HIV	human immunodeficiency virus
IDB	Inter-American Development Bank
ILO	International Labour Organization
IMF	International Monetary Fund
IT	information technology
LCDS	Low Carbon Development Strategy
MDG	Millennium Development Goals
MMU	Media Monitoring Unit
MoF	Ministry of Finance

MoFA	Ministry of Foreign Affairs
MOU	memorandum of understanding
NDS	National Development Strategy
NEX	national execution
NGO	non-governmental organization
NIM	national implementation
ODA	official development assistance
OECD	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
OP	Office of the President
PRSP	Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper
RC	Resident Coordinator
RR	Resident Representative
SCP	Social Cohesion Project
SLM	sustainable land management
TRAC	target for resource assignment from the core
UNAIDS	Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS
UNCBD	United Nations Convention on Biodiversity
UNCT	United Nations Country Team
UNCTAD	United Nations Conference on Trade and Development
UNDAF	United Nations Development Assistance Framework
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNECLAC	United Nations Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean
UNEG	United Nations Evaluation Group
UNESCO	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
UNFPA	United Nations Population Fund
UNICEF	United Nations Children's Fund
UNIFEM	United Nations Development Fund for Women
UN-REDD	United Nations Programme on Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Degradation
UNV	United Nations Volunteers

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

INTRODUCTION

Located on the north eastern coast of South America with a landmass of 214,969 square kilometers, Guyana is the only English-speaking country on the continent and had an estimated population of 736,000 persons in 2008. The population is concentrated in a narrow coastal belt bordering the Atlantic Ocean, an area that occupies only 10 percent of Guyana's land mass. Approximately 76.7 percent of Guyana's land surface is covered by dense forest, where scattered communities of the native Amerindian population live. Guyana's small population is composed of six different ethnic groups, the largest of which are those of East Indian descent, who are about 43.4 percent of the population, and Afro-Guyanese with about 30.2 percent. The other main groups are mixed race (16.7 percent), native Amerindians (9.2 percent) and the Chinese, Europeans and others totaling 0.3 percent. The country's economy is traditionally based on three main export commodities: sugar, rice and minerals such as gold and bauxite. The agricultural sector, which is mainly sugar and rice production, is the major contributor to Guyana's economy with about 30 percent of GDP in 2007, followed by industry (mainly mining and manufacturing) with 23 percent, and services (including the public sector) comprising about 47 percent. Environmental issues are of particular importance in Guyana due to its key role in global forestry conservation as evidenced by recent launch of the Low Carbon Development Strategy (LCDS).

The Assessment of Development Results (ADR), which was an evaluation of UNDP contribution to Guyana, was conducted between May and July 2009 by an independent evaluation team

composed of three external consultants and a task manager from the UNDP Evaluation Office, and supported by the work of a research assistant. The ADR covered the time period from 2001 to 2008. UNDP launched its second Country Cooperation Framework (CCF) for Guyana in 2001, which was extended to 2005. From 2006 to the present, the programme has operated under the County Programme Document (CPD) and Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP), which was co-designed with and approved by the government of Guyana in line with the country's main development priorities as found in the 2001-2006 Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (PRSP).

The broad objectives of the ADR were to assess overall UNDP performance and contribution to the development of Guyana during the past two programming cycles (2001-2005 and 2006-2010), and to extract recommendations to be applied in the design of future country strategies, particularly for the next programming cycle starting in 2012.¹

The ADR focused on several key criteria and topics that are standard across all ADRs conducted by the UNDP Evaluation Office. UNDP performance in contributing to development results in Guyana (as embodied in the CCF and CPD/CPAP) was assessed. The strategic positioning of UNDP was also assessed, that is, how UNDP situated itself within the development and policy space of the country and what strategies it took in assisting the development efforts led by the government and people of Guyana. The specific criteria applied were: effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, strategic relevance, strategic partnerships, responsiveness,

¹ The Guyana programme in UNDP has been extended to 2011.

and contribution to UN values and coordination. Under each criterion, specific subcriteria were used based on an evaluation framework approved by the Evaluation Office with extensive input from the main stakeholders in Guyana.

The ADR process unfolded in several stages. Following a scoping mission in June 2009, planning was conducted and a main mission took place in July 2009. After the data collection phase, the team analyzed the qualitative information collected from more than 200 participants (including main partners and beneficiaries) and then an inception report was drafted to outline the evaluation design. This report was carefully reviewed and revised several times through a multi-stage quality assurance process, including the Evaluation Office, expert external reviewers, UNDP senior management, the country office and government of Guyana. The final report was presented for discussion with country office colleagues and national partners during the stakeholder workshop. The final evaluation report is the result of extensive input and dialogue with a wide range of key partners in the UNDP Guyana programme.

UNDP IN GUYANA

The UNDP Guyana country programme is managed from the country office in Georgetown, Guyana, which is currently staffed with approximately 30 people. From 2004 to 2008, the average annual expenditure for the programme was \$3.55 million. From 2001 to 2008, the country programme supported 34 development initiatives totaling approximately \$24 million, which included both core and non-core resources.

Since 2001 the UNDP Guyana programme has focused its efforts within four main thematic areas—poverty reduction, democratic governance, environment and energy, and disaster recovery and risk reduction—as well as gender equality as a cross-cutting theme, which are all consistent with the first and second multi-year funding frameworks and the current corporate strategic plan (2008-2011). The largest number of

projects and expenditures were in environment and energy, followed by democratic governance, poverty reduction and disaster recovery and risk reduction. Presented below are key findings in each of these thematic areas.

Poverty reduction: The ADR found that work on poverty and livelihoods contributed to planned country results as well as provided some immediate benefits for vulnerable communities and beneficiary groups, especially in remote and rural communities. Poverty and livelihoods work under the CCF cycle from 2001 to 2005 built on what had been done in the late 1990s, with a continued emphasis on community-based poverty reduction work with Amerindian peoples, women, youth and the rural poor in line with key PRSP-I objectives and aims as well as UNDP corporate strategy and values. During the CPD-CPAP period the programme continued to evolve; results for poverty reduction were defined differently and there appeared to be attempts to create a better balance between upstream, policy-related work and downstream community initiatives. There was on-going support for building Millennium Development Goals (MDG) and PRSP monitoring capacities in the country (at both the national and regional levels), several ‘pilot’ initiatives to support small-scale economic development for isolated communities, and capacity building for small-scale entrepreneurs via the EMPRETEC project. However, several smaller-scale, downstream initiatives in community-based poverty reduction faced challenges in capturing the lessons of pilot initiatives as well as linking their effects to broader policy reform aims.

Democratic governance: Beginning in the early 2000s, UNDP work on democratic governance was based on continued involvement at the request of government in supporting national elections and on-going dialogue concerning how to strengthen the country’s key public sector and governance institutions. Several specific projects had some success in meeting their planned results over both programme cycles. During the CCF period, UNDP contribution was somewhat

limited in scope in comparison to the original plans outlined in the programme document, probably due to changes in the overall context. Consistent technical support was offered to the Guyana Electoral Commission (GECOM) and UNDP Guyana played a noteworthy role in negotiating multi-donor support for peaceful conduct during the 2006 elections. UNDP work in democratic governance did not dramatically expand from the CCF to CPD-CPAP periods, although the Social Cohesion Programme (SCP) did make some acknowledged contributions to national unity-building and constructive dialogue. However, the SCP evaluation noted that there were some weaknesses in the project, including its somewhat fragmented approach and its failure to truly build local organizational capacity or sufficiently engage local government structures, which was corroborated by the ADR team's own research. In 2007 the so-called Fast Track Initiative (FTI) spearheaded by UNDP Guyana mobilized a wide range of mainly short-term responses to the Bartica and Lusignan massacres, which appeared to help decrease the potential for wider social and political unrest among affected communities. UNDP Guyana also engaged with both women (especially in the early to mid-2000s) and with youth in its democratic governance programming.

Environment and energy: UNDP Guyana made some useful contributions to national results in the environment and energy area, and there were several examples of moderately effective projects that helped to build both individual and institutional capacities around natural resource and biodiversity management. The scope and variety of programming in the environment thematic area as a proportion of the total country programme increased over time, indicating both its emerging importance in Guyana and the ability of UNDP to respond and adapt accordingly. In response to emerging government interest in renewable energy issues, which surfaced in the early 2000s, UNDP Guyana increased its funding for this area and over the past several years supported an important pilot project in increasing access to renewable energy for hinterland areas. Support

for biodiversity and land use management regulations were also expanded in response to emerging needs. The major partners and beneficiaries for UNDP Guyana's work in this area were the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), at a broader institutional level, and various Amerindian communities in the hinterland areas, which involved building capacities for local land use planning and biodiversity management. Projects implemented by the EPA included conducting training workshops for key personnel from the EPA, the Guyana Forestry Commission and other environment-related agencies. The ADR found that institutional capacity building had a positive cumulative effect over several years, but there was a need for continued support to further enhance EPA capacities for regulatory enforcement. Work with Amerindian communities led to increased recognition over time among policy makers of the need to consult with affected communities, as witnessed by the extensive consultations currently taking place around the LCDS. This was also effective in assisting many hinterland communities to become stronger advocates for local environmental management practices. UNDP Guyana helped increase the resources available to Guyana via the Global Environment Facility (GEC), thereby assisting the country to meet global climate change reporting requirements.

Disaster recovery and risk reduction: The ADR found that UNDP made several useful contributions to country objectives and priorities in disaster recovery and management. This included support for both short-term response to emergency situations and longer-term aims to reduce Guyana's vulnerability to climate change and rising sea levels via capacity strengthening with key bodies such as the Civil Defense Commission (CDC) and National Drainage and Irrigation Authority. Two major floods—2005 being the most serious—resulted in 60 percent of Guyana's GDP being lost. UNDP supported the immediate post-flood recovery and reconstruction process in Guyana starting in March 2005, as well as follow-up to provide short-term livelihood inputs to the most-affected rural

communities. This further reinforced the need to better prepare for and build long-term capacity to respond to natural disasters and climate change. UNDP had previously assisted the government to prepare a comprehensive disaster management strategy for Guyana. Following the 2005 floods, UNDP was involved in planning for a comprehensive new project to strengthen local and national capacities for disaster response and risk reduction, which was launched in 2008 in close conjunction with other international partners including the Inter-American Development Bank (IDB). The project will support an update of the 2003 draft comprehensive disaster management strategy funded by UNDP, an update of emergency response and flood response plans, plus extensive capacity development for the CDC.

MAIN CONCLUSIONS

1. **In terms of overall development effectiveness, since 2001 UNDP Guyana made some progress towards its planned outcomes in all four thematic areas, which in turn contributed to Guyana's overall development priorities and aims.**

The UNDP country programme was characterized by very positive synergies among all the thematic areas, which enhanced effectiveness and was a sensible approach for a country programme of this size. The main challenges in the area of effectiveness consisted of finding the appropriate mix of policy-oriented and community-based interventions, ensuring that useful linkages were forged between the two levels on an on-going basis, and choosing the right combination of short-term initiatives or project investments so that longer-term programme outcomes could be achieved in a clear and demonstrable way.

In poverty reduction, the ADR concluded that UNDP had contributed to national capacity strengthening for poverty eradication in line with main PRSP-I objectives,

but these effects were difficult to measure. Currently one of the main challenges for poverty reduction in Guyana is that UNDP is viewed by most stakeholders as a source of funds for small-scale, community-based work by a range of government, non-state and international partners. Efforts are now being made to shift the focus towards broader, upstream initiatives in line with UNDP corporate priorities. In the future, UNDP Guyana will need to realistically consider what it can contribute at the grass-roots level of poverty reduction, in terms of small-scale, one-off economic development initiatives, due to its limited resources and the need to focus on underlying policy and structural issues to the greatest extent possible.

In democratic governance, UNDP Guyana contributed to the peaceful conduct during the 2006 elections and was also successful in promoting new paradigms of social inclusion in the country through the SCP, although it was very difficult to judge whether any of this work produced deeper changes to break down ethnic tensions in the country. So far very little has been done in public administration reform to enhance the institutional or policy frameworks related to accountability and transparency of the public service, which was a planned outcome under the CPD-CPAP. New initiatives currently being planned to strengthen aid coordination and poverty monitoring during the remainder of the programme cycle may address these gaps to some extent at least.

The environment and energy thematic area also made some contributions towards country-led objectives and outcomes, and the scope of work has gradually expanded since 2001. UNDP Guyana contributed to the government's emerging priorities and needs in renewable energy, and support became increasingly focused on natural resource management systems and access to alternative energy sources in under-served rural areas. Commendable progress was also

made towards strengthening management and protection of natural resources (by government and local communities), as well as economic and social empowerment of Amerindian communities in the hinterlands. The ADR concluded that UNDP Guyana has the strong potential to play a highly strategic role in these sectors in the future.

In natural disaster recovery and risk reduction, UNDP Guyana took a prominent role in coordinating the immediate response to the humanitarian crisis resulting from the 2005 floods and helping to strengthen institutional capacities for more sustained disaster prevention and risk management. The ADR concluded that UNDP contributed to creating an enabling environment for better long-term enforcement of existing standards/codes that govern coastal development and land use planning, as well as community involvement in disaster planning and response.

2. **Efficiency and sustainability were variable for the UNDP Guyana programme.**

There were many examples of good managerial efficiencies, which included strong synergies among thematic areas, leveraging of resources, and acceptable financial disbursement rates and administrative expense ratios according to UNDP corporate benchmarks. However, many projects had to be extended due to implementation delays and some of the small-scale investments made were possibly inadequate to assure lasting change resulting in developmental inefficiency. At the time of the ADR, the country programme had already begun to initiate some improvements in these areas. Positive examples of sustainability arising from UNDP work in Guyana were mainly at either the individual or organizational levels; fewer examples were found of sustained change being created at the policy and institutional levels. There were on-going challenges with the conduct of small-scale or 'pilot' economic development initiatives

in terms of both their financial or organizational viability and their ability to produce lasting development benefits for participants. Lessons learned from pilot initiatives were not always extracted and applied.

3. **Programme management was strong, but with room for continued improvements in some areas.**

The ADR concluded that the country programme was in the process of overcoming a number of on-going management and resource mobilization challenges—including weaknesses in results formulation and outcome level evaluation and reporting; as well as delays in project planning, approval and implementation—leading to numerous extensions. There were also challenges with on-going follow-up, monitoring and quality assurance by the country office with project partners and beneficiaries to ensure that problems were identified and corrective action taken in a timely fashion. These issues are now being diagnosed and addressed by an increasingly proactive and systematic management approach in the country office, but they will continue to require sustained effort in the future.

4. **UNDP demonstrated its strategic relevance in Guyana since the early 2000s, due to its alignment with country priorities within its four thematic areas.**

Overall UNDP comparative advantage corresponds not just to the amount of funding it provided, which was relatively modest in comparison to major international donors, but also the degree to which its strategic inputs in capacity development, small-scale demonstration projects and peace-building, as well as its flexibility and adaptability, were and are highly valued by partners at all levels. In the future UNDP strategic relevance is likely to rely mainly on the quality and precision of its upstream policy work as well as technical or capacity development inputs within and across all four thematic areas. UNDP Guyana has the possibility

to maintain its strategic focus on support for key institutional reforms, which will strengthen the country's future successful development as an emerging middle-income country. The ADR noted that the past relevance and overall strategic positioning of UNDP in Guyana has been influenced to some extent by relatively high turnover in the Resident Representative (RR) position.

5. **UNDP Guyana was responsive to emerging needs and forged strategic partnerships at many different levels.**

The agency reacted quickly to emerging needs in many cases, for example, the 2008 FTI, support for the 2006 elections and the 2005 floods response. UNPD Guyana also responded well to the increasing focus on environment and energy issues in the country by mobilizing more resources and technical support. Overall, the ADR found that UNDP Guyana was able to maintain an adequate balance between short-term responsiveness and longer-term development objectives. However, it was noted that the high demands placed on the country office during 2005 and 2006 due to the floods and elections did create some challenges in terms of maintaining focus on longer-term work. There has also been continuous emphasis on partnership-building with key national and international partners. When possible, UNDP Guyana has consistently reached out to involve civil society and the private sector, with more pronounced and sustained partnerships in the poverty reduction and democratic governance thematic areas and in environment and energy to some extent. Challenges include the need to deepen partnerships with civil society and the private sector, and with non-OECD (Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development) donors.

6. **UNDP Guyana made a strong and consistent contribution to UN values and coordination.**

Support for the MDG led to improved government commitment and stronger systems for tracking the country's progress on global development indicators. UNDP Guyana maintained consistent engagement with vulnerable groups such as Amerindians and the rural poor. The ADR concluded that initiatives with the vulnerable and poor could be further strengthened if there were clear action plans or strategies for the country programme outlining both the proposed coverage of this work and its scope and rationale, particularly with Amerindians in remote, rural communities who are likely to be heavily affected by future economic and environmental initiatives outlined under the LCDS. Weaknesses in gender mainstreaming also demonstrated the need to ensure that gender is thoroughly integrated into the programme in the future. In terms of UN coordination, UNDP played a positive leadership role in UNDAF planning but so far there has been weak implementation of joint programmes. It appeared that more practical steps need to be taken by UNDP as the lead UN Country Team (UNCT) agency in Guyana to help support greater project-level collaboration between the resident UN agencies.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. **Policy/upstream orientation**

UNDP Guyana should continue to reorient its programming towards higher-level policy change and strategic upstream work in support of the new PRSP-II and LCDS.

UNDP Guyana should continue to strengthen its recent shift towards a policy-oriented or upstream approach as stipulated in the UNDP corporate strategic plan to match the emerging lower-middle income status of Guyana and in close alignment with the strategic directions set in the new PRSP-II and LCDS. Eventually, given the shrinking resource base for this type of work, UNDP should seriously consider the feasibility of gradually and consciously moving

its strong focus towards a more strategic upstream approach from small-scale, downstream community-based work over the next five years. During this transition UNDP should also take into account the unique circumstances of the Guyana development context and the need to respond to key national priorities, and also ensure a clear interconnectedness between downstream and upstream work.

2. Inclusion and consultation

Consistent with the overall UNDP human development approach, UNDP Guyana should continue to strengthen its strategic approach to working with vulnerable groups and communities.

The strategic partnerships with targeted vulnerable groups, such as Amerindians and the rural poor, should be based on clearer criteria, more in-depth planning, consultations and needs assessments, and systematic analyses of the types of upstream (not just downstream) interventions needed with different subgroups. These processes should be carried out jointly with the lead government implementing agencies.

3. Capacity development

UNDP Guyana should develop a detailed strategy for capacity development that is focused on deep institutional change rather than on individual training or one-off knowledge transfer.

UNDP Guyana, in close consultation with government, should develop a longer-term strategy or specialized plan for capacity development that makes an explicit shift to development of strong, sustainable institutional systems commensurate with Guyana's emerging middle-income status. This strategy should take into account chronic human resource shortages in government and attempt to go beyond superficial, one-off approaches that simply enhance individual awareness or skills. Other potential examples that would require further discussion with

government for an agreement to be reached include support for more public sector, human resource development, the development of institutional incentives to reduce the brain-drain of skilled personnel, and mobilization of expertise from the diaspora to contribute more systematically to Guyana's economic and political development (all of which were raised during the ADR research by various partners).

The continued focus on national ownership is a very positive aspect of the UNDP programme, including emphasis on the national execution/implementation (NEX/NIM) modality. However, UNDP should do more in the future to develop managerial capacities and systems of partner agencies via explicitly building institutional capacity development processes into ongoing implementation processes.

4. Sustainability

UNDP Guyana should improve sustainability by working with implementing partners and beneficiaries to create realistic exit strategies for projects, extract and apply lessons, and replicate project effects.

UNDP should ensure that initial strategies are built into all project designs upfront so that explicit sustainability aims are set and progress towards sustainability can be monitored on a regular basis. Strategies could include explicit cost-sharing arrangements with lead partners, precise descriptions of how work initiated under UNDP-supported projects will be institutionalized in the long-term, and identification of specific benchmarks against which to assess progress towards sustainability linked to results-based frameworks shown in Annual Work Plans (AWPs). Such approaches would enable both UNDP and its implementing partners to understand whether results are likely to be sustained over time, as well as what interventions are needed to ensure this does occur as planned.

For so-called ‘pilot’ projects, UNDP should place greater effort on researching and learning lessons from similar initiatives undertaken by UNDP and others before planning and initiation. While pilot projects are actually being implemented, greater efforts should be made to learn from and share lessons to improve the effectiveness and chances for long-term replication of these efforts.

5. Strategic partnerships

UNDP Guyana should improve its partnership approach with non-state actors, as well as help strengthen the level of dialogue between these groups and government.

UNDP should continue to work closely with government to find ways of strengthening the meaningful and consistent engagement of non-state actors in development programming. This should include assistance for strengthening the partnerships forged by government with the private sector and civil society groups to implement specific capacity development projects in natural resource management and economic empowerment; in many countries these partnerships have been shown to be the most effective means to increase local ownership and sustainability. In order to guide its own work and establish more meaningful strategic and programmatic relationships with non-state actors, UNDP Guyana may also consider establishing a programme advisory committee for itself that regularly meets with representatives from a wide range of non-state actors, to provide UNDP Guyana with an opportunity to have more sustained strategic dialogue with these groups and ensure that they clearly understand the role of UNDP and its mandate.

6. Facilitation and coordination

UNDP Guyana should continue to facilitate strong dialogue and relationships between lead development partners including the government and the UN system when requested and appropriate.

UNDP should continue to play a role in leading and/or facilitating dialogue between government and international partners when requested and/or as appropriate, as well as in proactively coordinating donor support within specific sectors when key gaps or opportunities appear. The exact nature of this coordination role may of course vary between programme areas depending on the context and the needs within each sector as well as the role of international partners.

7. South-South cooperation

UNDP Guyana should develop a strategy and action plan for fostering South-South cooperation in-country, regionally and internationally on a range of key development issues.

South-South cooperation requires a more explicit plan and strategy in the context of the country programme as well as the regional development context, specifically in relation to the Caribbean Community (CARICOM) and larger movements for economic and social integration across the Caribbean such as the Caribbean Single Market Economy (CSME). UNDP should continue to be proactive and strategic in brokering more South-South exchanges and information-sharing on behalf of Guyana, as well as in response to emerging country needs, in areas such as respect for diversity, peace-building, climate change and environmental protection, alternate energy, small enterprise development, information technology, investment and manufacturing, public sector reform, human resource development, disaster management, and mobilization of investment/development resources from ‘non-traditional’ development and investment partners such as emerging economies in Asia and the Middle East. This would include fostering strategic exchanges both regionally and within Guyana itself.

8. Gender equality

UNDP Guyana should develop a strategy and action plan for mainstreaming of gender equality issues.

Given that there has been no gender mainstreaming strategy in place over the past several years and no explicit commitment of resources for working on gender mainstreaming issues in the country programme, UNDP should develop such a strategy to ensure that gender issues are fully integrated within each of the thematic areas and outcomes in the next CPD-CPAP. This should, at a minimum, involve allocation of specialized resources towards gender mainstreaming work, as well as development of measurable aims and indicators to gauge progress towards gender mainstreaming.

9. Support for the Resident Representative role

UNDP headquarters should improve its corporate support for the Resident Representative (RR) role in Guyana.

Due to the key role of the RR establishing and maintaining UNDP strategic positioning in Guyana, there should be increased analytical and strategic support from UNDP headquarters for the RR position in Guyana in order to decrease turnover and ensure leadership continuity.

10. Programme management and oversight

UNDP Guyana should continue to improve its mechanisms and systems to manage for development results.

UNDP Guyana has made substantial progress in improving its management systems in the past two years, but the momentum should be maintained to ensure that these initial measures are built on and expanded upon. This should include such areas as: continued support to enhancing results management and formulation of realistic and measurable results statements, design of more realistic project timeframes to prevent implementation delays, improved corporate record-keeping for the country programme, continued updating of the new resource mobilization strategy and close attention to options and opportunities for funding, increase in staffing levels commensurate with the programme's evolving needs, and enhanced focus on outcome monitoring and evaluation. There is also a need to continue to inform partners of results-based management (RBM) system requirements for effective project implementation, and to integrate partner capacity development and knowledge-sharing as much as possible into routine project implementation.

INTRODUCTION

1.1 OBJECTIVE AND SCOPE OF THE ADR

The Assessment of Development Results (ADR) in Guyana is an independent country-level evaluation conducted by the Evaluation Office of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) in 2009. The main objectives of the ADR are to assess overall UNDP performance and contribution to development in Guyana during the past two programming cycles (2001-2005 and 2006-2010), and to extract recommendations to be applied in the design of future country strategies, particularly for the next programming cycle 2010-2014.²

The ADR examined UNDP strategy and performance under the ongoing Country Programme Document (CPD) 2006-2010 for Guyana and accompanying Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP) for the same time period, as well as the previous Country Cooperation Framework (CCF)

for 2001-2005, with a closer look at the more recent programme. UNDP projects and activities within the context of the broader United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) 2006-2010 were evaluated. Finally, the ADR also considered the contribution made by UNDP in support of greater UN coordination and coherence in programming in Guyana since its introduction.

UNDP strategy and performance were evaluated from two perspectives. First, UNDP performance in contributing to development results in Guyana—as embodied in the CCF and CPD/CPAP—was assessed. Second, the strategic positioning of UNDP was assessed—how UNDP situated itself within the development and policy space of the country and what strategies it took in assisting the development efforts led by the government and people of Guyana. The questions used to guide the assessment under the main evaluation criteria are summarized in Table 1.

Table 1. Evaluation Criteria and Key Questions

Criteria	Key questions
Effectiveness	<p>How did implementation of any UNDP-funded projects (as well as any non-project activities) contribute to progress towards the stated development outcomes?</p> <p>How did the implementation of different projects and the mix of project and non-project intervention contribute to maximizing the results?</p> <p>Did the implementation of the projects have positive effects on poor and disadvantaged groups in Guyana (e.g. women, youth, Amerindian groups, or any other marginalized or vulnerable groups in the country), and if so, how were these results achieved?</p>
Efficiency	<p>Have the UNDP programmes been implemented within deadlines, costs estimates?</p> <p>Have UNDP and its partners taken prompt actions to solve implementation issues?</p> <p>Were the UNDP resources focused on the set of activities that were expected to produce significant results?</p> <p>Were resources combined among any UNDP interventions that contributed to reducing costs while supporting results?</p> <p>Did the programme implementation place an undue burden on some partners?</p> <p>If so, what were the consequences?</p>

² The current programming cycle, which officially ends in 2010, is likely to be extended until 2011.

Table 1. Evaluation Criteria and Key Questions (continued)

Criteria	Key questions
Sustainability	<p>Were interventions designed to have sustainable results given the identifiable risks and did they include an exit strategy?</p> <p>What issues emerged during implementation as a threat to sustainability?</p> <p>What were the corrective measures that were adopted?</p> <p>If there was testing of pilot initiatives, was a plan for scaling up initiatives prepared and how did it proceed?</p>
Strategic relevance	<p>Did UNDP address the development challenges and priorities and support the national strategies and priorities, while operating within its mandate as outlined in the current corporate Strategic Plan 2008-2011?</p> <p>Did the UNDP programme facilitate the implementation of the national development strategies and policies and play a complementary role to the government?</p> <p>Was the UNDP strategy designed to maximize the use of its corporate and comparative strengths as outlined in the Strategic Plan?</p>
Strategic partnerships	<p>Has UNDP leveraged its interventions through a series of partnerships to enhance their effectiveness?</p> <p>Have there been cases of missed opportunities for using partnerships more effectively?</p> <p>Has UNDP worked in partnership with non-state actors to maximize the impact of its projects?</p> <p>Has UNDP been effective in assisting the government to partner with external development partners?</p> <p>Has UNDP sought to maximize the opportunity of using South-South cooperation as a mechanism to enhance development effectiveness?</p>
Responsiveness	<p>Was UNDP responsive to the evolution over time of development challenges and the priorities in national strategies, or significant shifts due to external conditions, commensurate with its mandate and comparative strengths as outlined in the Multi-Year Funding Framework (2004-2007) and the Strategic Plan (2008-2011)?</p> <p>Did UNDP have an adequate mechanism to respond to significant changes in the country situation, in particular in crisis and emergencies?</p> <p>How are the short-term requests for assistance by the government balanced against long-term development needs?</p>
Contribution to United Nations values	<p>Is the UN system, and UNDP in particular, effectively supporting the government towards the achievement of the MDG?</p> <p>Is the UNDP programme designed to appropriately contribute to the attainment of gender equality?</p> <p>Did the UNDP programme target the needs of vulnerable or disadvantaged segments of society so as to advance towards social equity?</p>
Contribution to UN coordination	<p>Was the UNDAF process logical and coherent and undertaken in full partnership with UNCT and non-resident agencies and national stakeholders?</p> <p>Has UNDP facilitated greater programme collaboration among UN and other international agencies working in the country?</p> <p>Has UNDP been able to facilitate national access to the UN system's knowledge, expertise and other resources?</p>

1.2 METHODOLOGY

The ADR in Guyana was conducted by an independent evaluation team, composed of three external consultants, a team leader and two specialists, and a task manager from UNDP Evaluation Office, supported by the work of a research assistant.

The assessment of evaluability, the extent to which the subject of an evaluation is ready to be evaluated, began with the preliminary desk research in May 2009 and continued with a scoping mission and immediate follow-up to Guyana in June 2009 to establish the evaluation framework and approach to be used in the ADR. The evaluability assessment determined that the Guyana country programme was able to be evaluated in a credible and reliable manner and that there was sufficient primary and secondary data to assess performance according to all the main evaluation criteria. It also found there were no major barriers to the conduct of the evaluation, and that the limitations to the Guyana ADR would likely be trivial and therefore not liable to affect the credibility of the final conclusions and recommendations. The following information from the evaluability assessment was incorporated into the design of the ADR:

- Analysis was conducted of the main programme outcomes and results under each thematic area for the Guyana programme since 2001 (i.e. poverty reduction, democratic governance, environment/energy and disaster relief/mitigation), and a project list was generated of the main projects or initiatives undertaken to support outcome achievement for the entire ADR timeframe. This included financial data and lists of documents available for the programme.
- Given the relatively small number of development projects (approximately 34) implemented under the Guyana programme

since 2001 and the fact that many of the same partners or stakeholders were involved with multiple projects or initiatives over time, a draft list of individuals in key agencies to be interviewed was constructed based on the project/outcome and partnership mapping. Due to the structure of the programme, many key individuals were able to provide information on more than one UNDP-funded initiative. This allowed the ADR team to collect first-hand information from key personnel involved with approximately 29 development projects implemented during the two programming cycles. The project 'sample' therefore represented roughly 85 percent of the implemented projects.

- Both UNDAF and CPAP mid-term reviews were completed by the United Nations Country Team (UNCT) and UNDP country offices respectively in late 2008. This meant not only could the ADR draw on this information to enhance the analysis of overall country programme performance, several project-level evaluations were also available.
- There were some gaps in documentation and information for the CCF period (2001-2005). Therefore, the decision was made by the team to provide a more detailed performance assessment for the post-2005 period for which records and information were more easily available, but it was decided that there was sufficient information to provide a less detailed assessment for the earlier programme period.

The inception report was prepared and submitted to UNDP at the end of June 2009 and included a detailed evaluation framework on which the research was based.³ The ADR employed a variety of qualitative data collection methods such as document reviews, individual interviews, focus group meetings and observation, and discussions

³ See Annex 2 for a copy of this framework.

at selected project sites.⁴ The main evaluation mission took place in July 2009 to collect information from within the country based on the framework established during planning. Approximately 225 informants were interviewed for the ADR, including those who attended focus groups at various project sites.⁵ Visits to three regions in different parts of the country were undertaken by various members of the evaluation team. During the inception mission these regions were determined to be central for UNDP involvement with a number of project activities and beneficiaries cutting across various thematic areas.⁶ During the scoping mission interviews were also held at UNDP New York Headquarters and several telephone interviews were conducted with informants outside of Guyana following the main field mission in July. The final report was prepared and validated from August 2009 to April 2010 through the exchange of drafts among the Evaluation Office, the country office, the Government of Guyana (GoG) and other national stakeholders, as well as comments from an external review panel composed of experienced senior evaluators with development knowledge of Guyana and a participatory stakeholder workshop held in Guyana in April 2010.

The ADR was conducted in accordance with United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) Norms and Standards for Evaluation in the UN System (2005) and with the ADR Guidelines (2009) and draft Methods Manual (2009) of the UNDP Evaluation Office, as well as with universal evaluation best practices such as the triangulation principle and validation of facts and

findings with relevant stakeholders in an ethical, non-judgmental manner. The evaluators signed and adhered closely to the UNEG Code of Conduct (2007) throughout the ADR in terms of evaluation standards and ethics, including independence, impartiality, honesty and integrity, competence and accountability. Prior to every interview conducted by the team information was shared with individuals regarding respect for confidentiality. Other best practices followed by the team included avoidance of harm, accuracy, completeness, reliability and transparency. It should be noted that each evaluation team member signed a declaration of interest form (attached to the UNEG Code of Conduct) prior to commencing work on the evaluation, which clearly stated the extent to which they had any direct or indirect interests related to the focus of the ADR.

1.3 STRUCTURE OF THE REPORT

Following the introductory chapter, Chapter 2 provides information on the main development challenges facing the country (as embodied in key national policy documents), how the government has responded to these challenges over time, and the evolving role of external development assistance in this context. Chapter 3 outlines the UN response to Guyana's development challenges and the role of UNDP, as well as background information on the overall UNDP development assistance strategy and framework in Guyana (from 2001 to the present). Chapters 4 and 5 provide information on the main findings from the evaluation research. Specifically, Chapter 4 describes UNDP contribution to

⁴ The validity of qualitative information from purposive or pragmatic sampling is mainly assured in programme evaluations via triangulation or cross-checking to validate information obtained from multiple sources. See also Michael Quinn Patton, *Qualitative Research and Evaluation Methods*, 3rd Edition, Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, 2001 and E.G. Guba and Y.S. Lincoln, *Fourth Generation Evaluation*, Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, 1989 for more information on the qualitative techniques used to plan and implement the ADR.

⁵ See Annexes 4 and 5 for lists of individuals and documents consulted during data collection for the ADR.

⁶ Three regions were selected for site visits: Region 1, which is in the northwest of the country; Region 9, which is south-central; and Region 5, which is east of Georgetown. All are considered rural areas, but Regions 1 and 9 are classified as 'hinterlands' due to their remoteness from the settled coastal regions. The selection of these regions was judged by the ADR team, based on inputs from the country office, to provide a good cross-section of UNDP work in remote or rural areas, especially with the rural poor and Amerindian populations. Each region was deemed to have unique characteristics including partnership arrangements that would provide different perspectives on the programme.

development results according to three main evaluation criteria: effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability; and Chapter 5 provides information on UNDP strategic positioning in Guyana according to the evaluation criteria. Conclusions

and recommendations are provided in Chapter 6. The annexes at the end of the report provide information on the ADR Terms of Reference, the evaluation framework used and the individuals and documents consulted.

Chapter 2

DEVELOPMENT CHALLENGES AND NATIONAL STRATEGIES

2.1 NATIONAL DEVELOPMENT PRIORITIES

2.1.1 OVERVIEW OF THE NATIONAL DEVELOPMENT CONTEXT

Located on the north eastern coast of South America with a landmass of 214,969 square kilometers, Guyana has an estimated population of 736,000 persons as of 2008, which is mostly concentrated in a narrow coastal belt bordering the Atlantic Ocean that only occupies about 10 percent of Guyana's land space. According to recent figures approximately 76.7 percent of Guyana's land surface is covered by dense forest, where scattered communities of the native Amerindian population are located.⁷ A notable characteristic of Guyana's small population is that it is composed of six different ethnic groups, the largest of which are those of East Indian descent, about 43.4 percent of the population, and Afro-Guyanese who make up about 30.2 percent. The other main groups are mixed race (16.7 percent), native Amerindians (9.2 percent) and the Chinese, Europeans and others totaling the remaining 0.3 percent.⁸

Guyana graduated from Heavily Indebted Poor Countries (HIPC) status in 2007 and it is now officially ranked as a lower middle-income country under World Bank criteria. The country's

economy is traditionally based on three main export commodities: sugar, rice and minerals such as gold and bauxite. The agricultural sector, which is mainly sugar and rice production, is the major contributor to the Guyanese economy with about 30 percent of GDP in 2007, followed by industry (primarily mining and manufacturing) with 23 percent, and services (including the public sector) comprising about 47 percent. Since 2000 the GDP share of both the agricultural and industrial sectors declined slightly while services grew.⁹ Guyana has a highly educated population, although a large number of people have migrated to the United States, Canada and the United Kingdom. Out-migration of educated people has been a common issue for Guyana over the past several decades, which adds to the development challenges due to a declining population base to support productive activities in a relatively small economy. However, the Guyana diaspora overseas also contributes significantly to Guyana's economic development via the high volume of remittances sent home from this source.¹⁰ Given that the Guyanese birthrate is also dropping, combined with out-migration, the population growth for the country will continue to decline in the future.¹¹ Table 2 provides an overview of key economic and social development indicators for Guyana for the main time period covered by the ADR.¹²

⁷ UNECLAC, 'Statistical Yearbook for Latin America and the Caribbean,' 2008.

⁸ All national data is taken from the 2002 Guyana Population and Housing Census, published in 2005. Additional data cited in this section related to GDP and poverty figures are from the latest World Bank Country Assistance Strategy (released 2009) and the UN Common Country Assessments (2000 and 2005).

⁹ Figures on share of GDP are from the World Bank (2009).

¹⁰ Some observers claim that diaspora remittances represent up to 83 percent of ODA received by the country and therefore form a substantial part of the economy (Orozco, 2002).

¹¹ According to UNESCO projections found in the UNECLAC 'Statistical Yearbook for Latin America and the Caribbean' (2008), the Guyanese birthrate will likely decline from 17.1 percent for the current period (2005-2010) to around 15.9 percent for the following five years.

¹² Data for 2008 was used if available at the time of writing the report.

Table 2. Key Economic and Social Indicators for Guyana, 2000/2001 and 2006/2007¹³

Indicator	2000/2001	2006/2007
Human development index (HDI) value	0.740	0.729
GDP (USD billion)	\$0.71	\$1.1
GDP per capita (USD)	\$1,511	\$2,497
Real GDP growth (%)	-1.4	5.4
External debt (% of GDP)	167.4	66.8
Inflation rate (%)	6.1	8.1
Bank of Guyana assets (Guyana dollar million)	113,735.4	130,792.1
Population growth rate (%)	-0.12	-0.22
Birth rate (per thousand)	24.2	17.1
Mortality rate under five (per thousand)	70	60
Maternal mortality ratio (per 100,000 live births)	110	110
Life expectancy (years)	63	67
Illiteracy rate (% of population 15 years plus)	1.5	N/A
Public expenditure on education (% of GDP)	4.3	8.6
Public expenditure on health (% of GDP)	4.2	8.3
Combined gross enrolment ratio in education (%)	84	83.9
Ratio of girls to boys in education (%)	99	96
Total remittance inflows (USD million)	\$230	\$278
HIV/AIDS prevalence (%)	2.6	2.5
Human poverty index (HPI) value (%)	12.7	10.2
Gini index	44.6	44.6

Although very rich in natural resources, Guyana still faces considerable challenges in terms of overcoming poverty and providing for the equitable development of its people. According to the latest Guyana Millennium Development Goals (MDG) report for 2007, the proportion of people living below the poverty line was around 35 percent, while those in extreme poverty comprised 19 percent of the population.¹⁴ Based on research conducted by UN agencies in Guyana in 2000-2001, about 94 percent of the

hinterland population in Regions 8 and 9 were identified as living in extreme poverty, 79 percent of the population for interior communities as a whole, 45 percent for rural coastal areas and 29 percent for the city of Georgetown, clearly indicating the extreme disparities for different parts of the country.¹⁵

As a result of modernization and structural reforms in the economy Guyana experienced single digit inflation rates as far back as 1991, a

¹³ Multiple sources were used to compile the table: Guyana Bureau of Statistics (<http://www.statisticsguyana.gov.gy/>); Bank of Guyana (<http://www.bankofguyana.org.gy/>); CDB, 'Social and Economic Indicators 2006'; World Bank 'Country Assistance Strategy' 2009; World Bank 'World Development Indicators database' 2009; UNECLAC, 'Statistical Yearbook for Latin America and the Caribbean 2008'; IDB 'Country Strategy' 2008; UNDP 'Human Development Report 2003' (for 2000-2001 figures); International Monetary Fund (www.imf.org/external/pubs/ft/weo/); and UNDP 'Human Development Report 2009' (for 2007 figures).

¹⁴ These figures represent an improvement on the 43 percent and 29 percent respectively, which existed in 1993 when the current government took power. The marginal poverty gap for Guyana also declined from 16.2 percent in 1993 to 12.4 percent in 1999 according to the GoG, 'Guyana Millennium Development Goals Report 2007.'

¹⁵ United Nations Country Team, 'United Nations Common Country Assessment of Development Challenges in Guyana,' 2001.

7.4 percent growth in real output, and significant increases in per capita income by 1996. Since 1996 economic growth slowed due to a decline in commodity prices, unfavorable weather conditions and an unstable political environment, which discouraged investment. In addition the rate of private investment decreased significantly from 13.4 percent of GDP in 1998 to 6.6 percent in 2003.¹⁶ Nevertheless, due to fiscal reforms in the 1990s, the country managed to attain significant debt relief in the early 2000s, which eventually led to positive economic growth after the mid-2000s. However, the recent global economic problems are expected to have a ripple effect on Guyana's economy. Guyana is an active member of the regional Caribbean Community (CARICOM) including the Caribbean Single Market Economy (CSME) initiative, which is seen as an important strategy for maximizing the economic development opportunities of member states. If the integration of human resources flows and productive structures in CARICOM continues to evolve, Guyana may be able to build on this to further fuel its own economic development.

The country attained political independence from British colonial rule in 1966, but there were ongoing violent partisan political conflicts and ethnic polarization throughout the 1970s and 1980s. Guyana was finally able to achieve free and fair democratic elections in 1992, but the political context continued to be very volatile, which affected the social and economic development status of the country throughout the 1990s. The 1997 elections were accompanied by street protests and political violence. It took the intervention of outside mediators, most notably

CARICOM, to help broker a truce and a plan for long-term constitutional reform, which was embodied in the Herdmanston Accord signed by the major parties in 1998.¹⁷ The ensuing 2001 elections were also plagued by violence, but the 2006 elections were peaceful, which indicated the possibility for a more stable political context in the country given the right conditions.

2.1.1 DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORKS AND PRIORITIES

Guyana's development priorities and challenges for the timeframe covered by the ADR (2001-2008) are mainly summarized in the National Development Strategy (NDS), the National Competitiveness Strategy (NCS) and the first Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (PRSP-I). These were recently succeeded by the second Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (PRSP-II) and the Low Carbon Development Strategy (LCDS).

NDS

Prepared in the late 1990s, NDS was initially designed to cover the time period 2000 to 2010.¹⁸ The broad objectives identified in the NDS were: 1. attainment of economic growth, 2. poverty alleviation, 3. attainment of 'geographical unity,' 4. equitable geographic distribution of economic activity, and 5. diversification of the economy. The main development challenges facing the country at the time were economic instability due to budget deficits, high inflation rates, weak growth, and ongoing political and racial or ethnic tensions. However, the NDS lacked an operational strategy or action plan and specific expenditure targets. Most stakeholders

¹⁶ World Bank, 'A Time to Choose: Caribbean Development in the 21st Century,' 2005.

¹⁷ The Herdmanston Accord (signed 17 January 1998 in Guyana) recommended a process to examine how to bring about 'sustained dialogue' between the two main political parties. The accord acknowledged the need for constitutional reforms including establishment of a Constitutional Reform Commission to develop "arrangements for improvement of race relations in Guyana." Although there was and is strong support in principle among leaders in Guyana for the aims embodied in the Herdmanston Accord (see, for example, President Jagdeo's 2003 address 'Towards Greater Inclusive Governance: Building Trust to Achieve Genuine Political Cooperation'), the proposed Constitutional Reform Commission is still pending.

¹⁸ The NDS was first tabled in parliament in August 2000 and then retabled for approval in 2001. The NDS may in fact have been intended to have a longer lifespan post-2010, but it is unclear what formal provisions were made for regular review, updating and/or costing in relation to ongoing national budgetary plans.

acknowledge that it had limited practical utility in terms of guiding and monitoring ongoing development work in the country.

In order to support achievement of the NDS, the NCS was launched by Guyana in 2006 as a public-private partnership. This was meant to encourage new strategies for economic growth and to increase Guyana's ability to compete both regionally and subregionally within the context of the emerging CSME. The NCS contained three major components to focus on: core policies, sector policies and policies targeting strategic subsectors of the economy. The strategy called for improved policy coordination and leadership, public-private collaboration, analytical/technical capabilities and donor harmonization in order to enable its implementation. It also identified a number of specific action steps to revise and update existing policies affecting economic growth and investment in the country. However, progress on the NCS has not been as rapid as planned and many policy areas related to improving economic growth are still undergoing analysis and planning.

PRSP-I and II

During the late 1990s and early 2000s, the first complete PRSP for Guyana was prepared for the 2001 to 2006 time frame. Under this strategy, Guyana achieved the enhanced HIPC completion point in 2003, which enabled the country to obtain various forms of additional debt relief and financing.¹⁹ According to the PRSP-I, the social and political challenges of the 1990s in Guyana—including rising foreign indebtedness, continued brain drain and lack of investment in the economy—had led to high levels of rural poverty, especially in interior areas of the country, uneven rates of educational attainment, weak local government systems, poor regulatory and institutional systems discouraging private investment, and deteriorating social services. It described the following specific development

priorities for Guyana, most of which are still present:

- Support for economic policies to stimulate growth, including improved fiscal/macroeconomic policies, support for private sector growth, expansion of the economic base to benefit the poor, restructuring and modernizing the traditional sector, developing new economic sectors to support growth, and protecting the environment.
- Promotion of good governance and restoration of confidence in the business environment, including institutional and regulatory reforms, and improved public accountability and confidence in the political system through crime reduction, attention to the rule of law and administration of justice, local government reform and human rights protection.
- Investment in human capital, including improvement of education and health services.
- Support for improvements in infrastructure services, including water systems, sewage/sanitation and housing.
- Design of a social safety net strategy to support the poor and vulnerable directly in times of need.
- Major infrastructure development, including improving the maintenance, quality and coverage of sea defenses, roads and drainage/irrigation schemes, and rural electrification.

The PRSP mentioned several special interventions that the government would undertake in Regions 1, 8, 9 and 10 due to particularly high poverty rates and/or social vulnerabilities in those regions. These were mainly geared towards specific support for Amerindian peoples in Regions 1, 8 and 9, who have historically had much higher poverty levels than other segments of the population, as well as enhanced investment in economic development of Region 10, where jobs were lost in the mining sector.

¹⁹ World Bank, 'Memorandum and Recommendation of the President of the IDA to the Executive Directors on Assistance to the Cooperative Republic of Guyana under the Enhanced HIPC Debt Initiative,' November 2003.

PRSP progress reports were prepared and released by the GoG in 2004 and 2005, based on public consultations and collection of relevant statistical data to gauge progress within key areas. These reports provided a largely favorable picture of progress towards key targets although there was acknowledgement that detailed operational plans to effectively implement all aspects of the PRSP were missing in some instances. Although the 2001 PRSP did not explicitly mention linkages to the MDG, these were fully integrated with the PRSP over time and stand-alone MDG reports were also prepared by the government in 2003, 2004 and 2007, which provided additional information on progress towards some of the key aims in the PRSP.²⁰ A second PRSP was to be launched in 2007 for the next five years, but this was delayed and a draft PRSP-II was instead prepared in 2008 covering only four years.²¹

LCDS

During the period covered by the ADR, Guyana undertook important and innovative conservation measures including establishing the first conservation concession in the world, working together with Amerindian communities to launch the country's first community-owned conservation area and (more recently) engaging in a

precedent-setting initiative to possibly catalyze a future market for ecosystem services. Over the past several years, the GoG committed to include 10 percent of its national territory (the global average) in a protected areas system, although at present it is the only country in the hemisphere that does not have a protected areas system. Protected area legislation has been drafted (but not yet tabled in parliament) and several new protected areas are now being considered. A number of important international treaties and conventions have been signed by the GoG both before and during the time period covered by the ADR.²² Also since the early 2000s, the GoG increased its focus on providing energy to the hinterlands and on increasing energy access for all. Major environment-related policy documents outlining these priorities and in effect for the time period covered by the ADR include: the Guyana Climate Change Action Plan 2001, the National Biodiversity Action Plan 1999/2006, the National Environmental Action Plan 1994, the Amerindian Act (amended 2006), and the Energy Policy of Guyana 1994.

In the new LCDS (released in mid-2009), the GoG places even greater importance on many environmental priorities, which were established in past national policy frameworks and documents,

²⁰ The ADR team was not able to obtain copies of the 2003 and 2004 MDG reports.

²¹ The new PRSP was still awaiting ratification by parliament at the time the ADR took place. The PRSP-II draft document was shared with international partners in Guyana as well as accepted by the World Bank board in mid-2009 as the basis for its new Country Assistance Strategy (CAS). The draft PRSP-II has evidently retained the seven pillars mentioned in PRSP-I, and the main objectives and areas of focus follow through with the key national development aims and areas of focus from the early 2000s. There is more data presented from poverty and demographic surveys to assist in evidence-based planning; acknowledgement is provided in the PRSP-II (and more recently by government officials interviewed for the ADR) that targets, strategies, and indicators need to be realistically adapted to the timeframes and resources available as well as to the challenging and rapidly evolving global economic context. A wide range of secondary policy initiatives are closely linked to the PRSP-II such as a new NCS to foster improved economic growth and investment, potential taxation reform and a legislative package for local government reform that mostly builds on what was done during the PRSP-I period—clearly indicating the government's priorities continue to focus on competitive growth, good governance and improved provision of public goods.

²² These were: United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), United Nations Convention on Biodiversity (UNCBD), Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Flora and Fauna (CITES), International Plant Protection Convention, Convention concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage (World Heritage), Kyoto and Montreal Protocols, United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD), International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution (MARPOL 73/78), Vienna Convention for the Protection of the Ozone Layer, and Basel Convention on the Control of Trans-boundary Movement of Hazardous Wastes and their Disposal. Guyana also participates in the following for which instruments of accession are still being awaited: Convention on Wetlands (Ramsar Convention) and Convention for the Production and Development of the Marine Environment in the Wider Caribbean Region and its Protocols (Cartagena Convention).

thereby strongly aligning itself with emerging global initiatives to both combat climate change and undertake sustainable development, most notably the United Nations Programme on Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Degradation (UN-REDD). The main priorities identified in the LCDS are as follows:

- Increase the use of renewable energy resources and its accessibility in hinterland communities.
- Develop and expand Guyana's protected areas system and fulfilment of commitment to place 10 percent of territory into conservation areas.
- Completion of the continuing process of demarcation and titling of indigenous lands.
- Provide incentives for communities to effectively engage in natural resource conservation, including preparing communities to be involved in forest inventories, monitoring and establishment of field plots.
- Streamline environment and energy institutional structures and mandates.
- Ensure laws regarding forestry, mining and other land uses are continually updated as needed, and build national capacity to the level that will enable effective implementation of environment policies and laws.
- Establish a successful working model for sale of forest carbon credits and determining how benefits can best be shared within the country.

Two major floods (2005 being the most serious) affected Guyana during this period, resulting in 60 percent of Guyana's GDP being lost.²³ This reinforced the need to better prepare for and build capacity to respond to natural disasters

and to climate change. This is now integrated within the LCDS. Accordingly the main natural disaster-related issues/priorities in recent years for the government were as follows:

- Improve preparations for natural disasters via increased public awareness.
- Upgrade seawall defenses and other infrastructure.
- Improve community-based risk and vulnerability assessments, development of national and community-level natural disaster plans, and capacity to implement plans and use of effective early warning systems.
- Increase information, coordination and communication capacities.

2.2 ROLE OF EXTERNAL ASSISTANCE

As shown in Table 3, Guyana received official development assistance (ODA) totaling approximately \$871 million for the time period of 2001 to 2007 according to the Development Assistance Committee of the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD-DAC). In 2001 ODA represented 14.6 percent of Guyana's GDP, but had risen to 17 percent by 2005.²⁴ Fluctuations in the annual amounts for ODA to Guyana in 2006 were probably due to the influx of support for the 2005 floods, which were the worst natural disaster in Guyanese history. ODA declined again in 2007 and aid-per-capita decreased from \$230 in 1990 to \$168 in 2007, although continued out-migration from the country may influence these statistics.²⁵ According to the World Bank, Guyana remains the fifth highest aid-per-capita country in the Latin America and Caribbean region.²⁶ However, because it is now officially classified by the World Bank as

²³ See UNDP Guyana/UNECLAC, 'Guyana: Socio-Economic Assessment of the Damages and Losses Caused by the January-February 2005 Flooding,' March 2005.

²⁴ Figures on ODA as percentage of GDP are taken from Human Development Report 2003 and Human Development Report 2007.

²⁵ Figures from OECD DAC 2009 and World Bank 2008.

²⁶ The global average in aid-per-capita for lower middle-income countries is \$9.

a lower middle-income country, Guyana is no longer eligible for some forms of bilateral and multilateral assistance that it received previously as a low-income country.

The major international donors to Guyana and the amounts disbursed by each for the years 2001 to 2007 are shown in Table 4, sorted in descending order for the total amount.

The lead international relationships between Guyana and its development partners are based mainly on long-standing economic or historical ties. For example, there are strong historical and economic ties between Guyana the United States, the United Kingdom and Canada; these countries have been the sources for much foreign investment as well as the main destinations for the majority of Guyanese emigrants. While most of the lead donors have resident offices in Guyana, the Caribbean Development Bank (CDB), Japan and non-traditional donors such as the Arab states are all non-resident agencies. With the achievement

of the HIPC completion point, the International Monetary Fund (IMF) became less active in Guyana and closed its country office in 2006. Most of the aid allocated to Guyana continues to be in the form of project-based support, although recently the European Union (EU) placed most of their funds in budgetary support. Pooled funds or sector-wide approaches are not yet common in Guyana, although all international partners as well as the government support the principles of the Paris Declaration.

The ADR team learned that there were likely to be some shifts in focus for the major international partners because of Guyana's relatively high aid-per-capita situation, the small size of the economy, the global economic recession and the country's recent accession to lower middle-income status. For example, both the Department for International Development (DFID) and the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA) are now moving to a regional development approach in the Caribbean, which includes

Table 3. ODA Flows to Guyana 2001-2007 (USD millions)²⁷

2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
112.13	71.82	96.06	145.14	149.72	172.93	124.17

Table 4. Major International Donors to Guyana 2001-2007 (USD millions)²⁸

Country/agency	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	Total
IDB	48.22	24.57	36.78	43.8	48.44	44.88	46.04	292.73
US	15.75	11.51	8.39	19.71	17.6	23.55	21.14	117.65
EU	20.75	17.59	10.36	32.3	12.97	10.89	7.6	112.46
UK	18.13	14.87	9.42	20.29	12.09	6.33	4.63	85.76
CDB	4.53	4.42	8	11.45	8.57	12.79	9.34	59.10
IDA (WB)	7.29	5.86	19.81	5.94	1.22	10.55	2.47	53.14
Canada	4.73	4.17	7.09	7.54	8.85	6.36	7.04	45.78
IMF	-5.48	-1.83	0.16	2.71	21.51	27.24	—	44.31
Japan	4.77	0.69	2.85	10.72	0.5	5.63	4.23	29.39
UN agencies ²⁹	1.83	2.13	1.62	1.94	2.85	1.7	2.46	14.53

²⁷ OECD DAC 2009.

²⁸ OECD DAC 2009.

²⁹ The figure shown for UN agencies includes core agency resources only, not additional leveraged funds.

Guyana, in order to increase efficiencies. In general the ADR found all current bilateral and multilateral donors remain committed to supporting economic development as well as social and political stability in Guyana, but because of shrinking aid budgets their level of financial commitment may be less.

In the past, many international partners were evidently concerned about Guyana's relatively high level of dependence on external assistance, given the size of its population and economy. From what the ADR could determine what emerged during the past decade was a more focused and strategic approach among international partners, less tolerance for risk and misuse of funds, and greater emphasis on developmental performance as measured, for example, by progress towards key PRSP and MDG indicators. There was also the recognized need on the part of the Guyanese government to ensure increased diversification of external development and investment resources as well as to ensure stronger national ownership of the development process as embodied in the 2005 Paris Declaration.

The draft PRSP-II predicts that there may be an external financing gap of approximately \$40 million per year from 2008 to 2012 due to changes in funding flows to the country, partly as a result of the many factors mentioned above. On the other hand, the new LCDS does provide an economic proposal for sustainable forest use and preservation in Guyana so standing forests can be protected while promoting sustainable

resource development and poverty reduction. While overall donor assistance to Guyana appeared to be decreasing, several international partners appear to have increased their prioritization of resources towards the environment and energy thematic areas. Also, aside from bilateral and multilateral partners, there will be a role for key international non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and inter-governmental agencies (such as the Conservation International, World Wildlife Fund and International Tropical Timber Organization) to play in environment sector support.

Another area of external assistance for Guyana has been and will likely continue to be an expansion of interest and investment from countries outside North America and Western Europe, including the Arab states (as noted in Table 4), China, Brazil, India, Cuba and Venezuela. These are countries that are not members of the OECD-DAC and do not necessarily have 'traditional' foreign aid programmes, but may be interested in pursuing both economic and strategic opportunities in Guyana that also link to the country's main development and growth priorities. For example, China has invested some funds in infrastructure development in Guyana, signed cooperation agreements on trade and offered low interest loans in several key areas related to Guyana's economic development. Venezuela forged a preferential oil supply deal with the GoG in 2008, as well as forgave millions of dollars of foreign debt and financed several small-scale local projects in Guyana.

UNDP RESPONSE AND STRATEGIES

3.1 UN AND UNDP ROLES IN GUYANA

UNCT

The UNCT for Guyana consisted of the following resident agencies as of mid-2009: UNDP, United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF), United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA),³⁰ Pan-American Health Organization/World Health Organization (WHO), Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS (UNAIDS), Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO)³¹ and United Nations Volunteers (UNV).³² Non-resident agencies linked with the Guyana UNCT include United Nations Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (UNECLAC), International Labour Organization (ILO), United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), United Nations Development Fund for Women (UNIFEM), United Nations Information Centre, and International Telecommunications Union. UNDAF 2006-2010, which was prepared in 2005, stated that at the time the UN family of agencies provided approximately 1 percent of Guyana's ODA.

UNCT is under the overall responsibility of the UN Resident Coordinator (RC) (i.e. UNDP Resident Representative); and there are subsidiary UN theme groups composed of representatives of UNCT members in HIV, operations management, programme coordination and communication, information, and advocacy groups. UNDP participates in each of these theme groups and it plays a leadership and/

or coordination role in all of them due to the small size of UNCT. Each group has clear terms of reference.

CCA/UNDAF (2001-2005)

The first UNDAF programme cycle was 2000-2005, followed by a second cycle in 2006-2010, which is still ongoing and likely to be extended into 2011 enabling all UN agency programme cycles to be fully aligned by 2012.

The 2000 Common Country Assessment (CCA) investigated and verified the key issues and development priorities present in the political and economic context at that time. It noted that a process of constitutional reform had been ongoing since the late 1990s but still had to be completed, coupled with the pressures of the economic reform and adjustment process under HIPC. According to the analysis provided this had negatively influenced growth and development processes up until 2000, so the main areas identified for UN system support were human resource development and capacity building, poverty eradication and health promotion. The CCA stressed coherence with the NDS and mentioned the need to implement a regionally-sponsored 'Directional Plan on Poverty Eradication', achieve expenditure targets for combating poverty, and create small-scale business opportunities for the unemployed, disadvantaged or marginalized groups including women and Amerindians. Overall, this appeared to be a very detailed, thorough analysis with clear identification of priorities and good alignment

³⁰ UNFPA does not have a full country office in Guyana. There is an assistant representative who reports to the UNFPA regional office in Jamaica.

³¹ After an absence of 25 years, the FAO re-established an office in Guyana in mid-2009.

³² There is also an ILO project located in Guyana whose coordinator attends UNCT meetings.

with government priorities as formulated or understood at the time.

The 2001 UNDAF emphasized the need for a rights-based approach to development, greater coherence among UN agencies and the desire of the UN agencies to support the government in addressing the proposed constitutional and governance changes discussed in the late 1990s. The three long-term outcomes of the UNDAF were stated as follows:

- Progressive realization of the Guyanese people, beginning with the most deprived, of their economic, social, cultural, civil and political rights.
- Facilitating meaningful participation of all Guyanese in the political process.
- Assisting the State to respect, protect and fulfil the rights of all citizens and to be accountable for the positive and negative responsibilities associated with this duty.

Within these broader outcomes, the main strategies were:

1. increasing the standard of living via support for relevant policy reform (e.g. creation of protected areas, other aspects of environmental well-being, underlying factors related to food security and poverty reduction, increase food access for the poor, and support for natural disaster prevention and mitigation);
2. protection and assistance for families, women and children (e.g. adherence to international conventions to respect women and childrens' rights);
3. health system support (e.g. capacity development, access and management);
4. promotion of educational rights (e.g. increasing quality education and access to information technology, IT);
5. increasing access to employment (e.g. economic and employment policies, especially in rural areas); and

6. promotion of civil and political rights (e.g. supporting the implementation of human rights instruments and affirmative action programmes, supporting institutional strengthening and capacity building of political institutions, as well as the judiciary and enforcement entities).

UNDP was expected to tailor its programming to fit within and contribute towards these strategic directions, specifically those related to economic opportunities and respect for rights. However, the 2001 UNDAF did not contain explicit results and monitoring framework, which could be used by UNCT to assess ongoing progress towards these strategies.

CCA/UNDAF (2006-2010)

The 2005 CCA identified three broad priority areas for development work in Guyana: 1. expanding human capabilities, 2. fostering empowerment, and 3. widening opportunities. The CCA verified civil society empowerment, security issues (in relation to stability and consensus-building), and alignment with pro-poor development policy as embodied in the NDS, PRSP-I, MDG and HIPC initiative (such as ongoing government investment in essential human needs) as key national priorities. It also stressed the linkages between successful completion of the PRSP-I, which at that time was behind schedule, and sound macroeconomic policies.

Subsequently the 2006 UNDAF identified three main national priorities, which UN agencies would support: 1. poverty elimination through investing in people and requisite physical capital, with a target set of a minimum 10 percent increase in the number of Guyanese accessing quality services; 2. an inclusion system of governance based on the rule of law in which citizens and their organizations participate in the decision-making processes that affect their well-being, this would include establishment of the five constitutional rights commissions; and 3. a macroeconomic framework and sustainable economic base conducive to the elimination of

poverty, with a target of reducing poverty to 28 percent by 2010 through stimulation of economic growth and employment generation.

The UNDAF included a results matrix with three UN agency outcomes linked to the above national priorities, as well as a monitoring and evaluation framework that indicated the UN family division of labour and provided a means of measuring success. Specific contributions were proposed for UNDP in the areas of promoting pro-poor economic growth, support for private sector development, strengthening of public sector management systems and access to basic services, increased social cohesion, and support for the electoral process rule of law and rights-based approaches. In turn these priority areas, described in the next section of the report, were linked explicitly to the UNDP programme framework.

In 2008 a mid-term review of the current UNDAF was undertaken.³³ The report was generally complimentary of the UNDAF design and the relevance of the identified strategies and aims. It noted all UN agencies including UNDP had considerably contributed towards meeting UNDAF aims and stated outcomes one and two were likely to be achieved by 2010, with some provisos regarding outcome three related to poverty. However several short-comings were highlighted, including over-ambitious objectives, lack of clear baselines for measuring progress, lack of clarity regarding outcome and output definition (including poorly-defined targets), the need for a more precise human-resource capacity development strategy to support the country's priorities in this area, and the urgent requirement for further resource mobilization to support UNDAF goals.

3.2 UNDP DEVELOPMENT APPROACH

3.2.1 THEMATIC AREAS AND KEY PARTNERS IN THE UNDP COUNTRY PROGRAMME

Under the CCF 2001-2005 there were three thematic areas: poverty reduction, democratic governance and environment. The main objectives of the country programme (see Table 5) were clearly linked to the government's main priorities but not explicitly aligned to the broader UNDAF because that process was still at the preliminary stage. In the more recent CPD-CPAP from 2006 to the present, the main outcomes were again very closely linked to government priorities and the linkages with the UNDAF were much more explicit and clear. After 2006, energy was officially added to the environment portfolio and the thematic area of natural disaster recovery and risk reduction was split off into its own practice area, even though work on both these areas initially fell under the environment portfolio. Currently there are four major thematic areas in the programme, which are well-established as separate practice areas; a cluster of outcomes is clearly identified for each one linked in turn to the larger UNDAF results framework (see Table 6). At various stages specific programming on gender was subsumed under both the poverty reduction and democratic governance thematic areas. HIV/AIDS was included in the CPD as a separate suboutcome under poverty reduction, but was not included in the CPAP.

National development partners for UNDP have largely remained the same under each thematic area over the past several years, as shown in Table 5, even though the extent of involvement of some partners has varied based on specific initiatives. Due to Guyana's small size and the interlinked nature of development work in the country, UNDP has worked with several key partners within different thematic areas.

³³ 'Mid-Term Review of UNDAF 2006-2010 of the United Nations,' November 2008.

Table 5. Thematic Areas and National Development Partners for UNDP in Guyana

Thematic area	National Development Partners
Poverty reduction	Office of the President, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Ministry of Finance, Ministry of Amerindian Affairs, Bureau of Statistics, Ministry of Local Government, Guyana Manufacturers Association, Private Sector Commission
Democratic governance	Office of the President, Guyana Electoral Commission, Ministry of Local Government and local government authorities, Ministry of Culture, Youth and Sport, Women's Affairs Bureau, Ethnic Relations Commission, plus various NGOs and community- and faith-based groups
Environment and energy	Office of the Prime Minister, Ministry of Agriculture, Ministry of Amerindian Affairs, Environmental Protection Agency, Guyana Lands and Surveys Commission, Iwokrama Rainforest Centre, Guyana Marine Turtle Conservation Society, Guyana Forestry Commission, Guyana Energy Commission
Natural disaster recovery and risk reduction	Office of the President, Civil Defense Commission, Ministry of Agriculture, various community-based groups

3.2.2 COUNTRY PROGRAMME RESULTS/OUTCOMES

Elaboration of results evolved over time for the country programme from a small number in the CPD to a much more complex and

detailed elaboration of proposed outcomes and corresponding outputs under the CPD-CPAP, with attached targets and indicators. An overview of planned results for the Guyana country programme since 2001 is provided in Table 6.

Table 6. Results Overview for Guyana Country Programme

Country Cooperation Framework 2001–2003 (extended to 2005) ³⁴	
Planned Objectives	Proposed Initiatives/Outputs
<p>Poverty reduction (ref CCF, paragraph 19)</p> <p>To provide catalytic and synergistic support for achieving the goals of the national capacity-strengthening for poverty eradication.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Capacity building and strengthening of IT systems within government ministries • Strengthening and upgrading the statistical system with the Bureau of Statistics • Productive employment, income generation and leadership/skills development for Amerindians and women
<p>Democratic governance (ref CCF, paragraph 24)</p> <p>To continue to provide support for efforts to build an inclusive democracy.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continuing support to the constitutional reform process • Gender, within the context of empowerment for development • Strengthening of local, municipal, regional and national institutions and organs of governance • Support for the electoral process • Assistance in consensus-building activities and consultations, including institutional development of the proposed Race Relations Commission³⁵
<p>Environment (implied objective—see subtitle before paragraph 25)</p> <p>Human resource development for environmental stability</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Training of government officials in the EPA, the Guyana Geology and Mines Commission, the Guyana Forestry Commission and the Guyana National Bureau of Standards • Community sensitization dialogues regarding environmental issues (forestry, mining and urban household sanitation) • Capacity development of the EPA to undertake its mandate

³⁴ Note that there was no formal results framework provided in the CCF (dated 9 November 2001). Therefore, the objectives and initiatives/outputs were extrapolated from the document, but they have been treated as putative 'results statements' for the purpose of the performance analysis in the ADR.

³⁵ See the CCF document, paragraph 24 page 7, which uses the term 'Race Relations Commission.' The official title of this body was evidently later changed to the Ethnic Relations Commission.

Table 6. Results Overview for Guyana Country Programme (continued)

Country Programme Document 2005–2010 ³⁶	
Planned Objectives	Proposed Outputs
<p>Poverty reduction (ref. CPD RRF page 6)</p> <p>Note: Planned results for poverty reduction are subsumed under UNDAF Outcome No. 3, ‘Reduce poverty by 28 percent by 2010 through stimulation of growth and job creation (MDGs 1 and 8).’</p> <p>A. PRS/PRSP prepared to ensure participatory process with civil society in policy formulation and programming, and taking into consideration clear linkages with human development and the MDG.</p> <p><i>Corresponds to CPAP RRF (2006) OC 1.2: Pro-poor policy reform to achieve MDG targets; and OC 1.2.1: PRS/PRSP prepared through substantive participatory process to ensure clear linkages with human development and the MDG.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improve capacity to monitor and manage indicators • System developed to ensure broad-based participation in preparing strategies and policies
<p>B. Broad-based, multi-sectoral and multi-level response generated, integrating HIV/AIDS into national development plans and mainstreaming HIV/AIDS into key sectors and ministries.</p> <p><i>No corresponding CPAP outcome.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No information provided
<p>C. Local poverty initiative(s) linked to policy change undertaken.</p> <p><i>Corresponds to CPAP RRF OC 1.3: Local poverty initiatives, including microfinance; and 1.3.2: Replicable poverty linkages initiative(s) linked to policy change undertaken.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Capacity built to develop decentralized poverty-reduction strategies, incorporating disaster management strategies • Capacity of private sector built to improve business processes towards the achievement of the MDG, including engaging in partnerships for development
<p>D. Community and regional development strategies will take into consideration national, sectoral and external trade policies.</p> <p><i>No corresponding CPAP outcome.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No information provided
<p>Democratic governance (ref CPD RRF page 7)</p> <p>Note: Planned results for governance are subsumed under UNDAF Outcome No. 2, ‘Empowered individuals and groups, strengthened institutions and an enabling constitutional and human rights framework.’</p> <p>A. Institutional/legal/policy frameworks established to promote and enforce accountability, transparency and integrity in the public service.</p> <p><i>Corresponds to CPAP RRF OC 2.7: Public administration reform and anti-corruption; and OC 2.7.2: Institution/legal/policy frameworks established to promote and enforce accountability, transparency and integrity in public service.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Elections held to international standards • Government’s ability to promote human rights strengthened • Access to and quality of justice improved
<p>B. Social cohesion and peace-building approaches factored into national development frameworks, and integrated into programmes designed and implemented at the national and local level (with due regard paid to the promotion of human rights).</p> <p><i>Corresponds to CPAP RRF OC 4.1: Social cohesion and peace-building; and OC 4.1.2: Social cohesion and peace-building approaches informed/factored into national development frameworks, and integrated programmes designed and implemented at national and local level.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Capacity built in institutions, civil society organizations and political parties in social cohesion and peace-building • Political dialogue and inclusivity in governance strengthening

³⁶ For the purposes of summarizing the results areas in the latest programme cycle, the outcome column provides information on what is found in both the CPD and CPAP (to show how the two documents are essentially consolidated within the CPAP results framework). The outputs are those stated in the official CPAP results and resource framework agreed between UNDP and GoG.

Table 6. Results Overview for Guyana Country Programme (continued)

Country programme document 2005–2010	
Planned Objectives	Proposed Outputs
<p>Environment and energy (ref. CPD RRF page 6)</p> <p>Note: Planned results for environment and energy are subsumed under UNDAF Outcomes No. 1 ‘An increase in at least 10 percent in the proportion of Guyanese accessing quality services in education, health, water and sanitation, and housing with capabilities enhanced to maximize available opportunities, and No. 3 ‘Reduce poverty by 28 percent by 2010 through stimulation of growth and job creation under MDGs 1 and 8.’</p> <p>A. Access to energy services, electricity or cleaner fuels in rural areas increased.</p> <p><i>Corresponds to CPAP RRF OC 3.3: Access to sustainable energy services; and OC 3.3.2: Access to energy services, electricity or cleaner fuels in rural areas increased.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Capacity built in hinterland communities for renewable energy • Capacity built in the use of renewable energy technologies
<p>B. Value of biodiversity factored into national planning, and government and local communities empowered to better manage biodiversity and the ecosystem.</p> <p><i>Corresponds to CPAP RRF OC 3.5: Conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity; OC 3.5.1: Contribution of biodiversity and ecosystem services to food security, health, livelihoods and reduced vulnerability to natural disasters factored into national planning for achievement of development goals, including safeguards to protect these resources; and OC 3.5.2: Communities and local communities empowered to better manage biodiversity and the ecosystem it provides.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Capacity built to manage community natural resources • Capacity built at the national level to manage natural resources • Capacity built for land use management
<p>Natural disaster recovery and risk reduction (ref. CPD RRF page 6)</p> <p>Sector-specific, national and local expertise developed, covering disaster-preparedness planning and mitigation of risks and vulnerabilities with specific attention to gender.</p> <p><i>Corresponds to CPAP RRF OC 4.5: Natural disaster reduction; and OC 4.5.2 Sector-specific national and local expertise developed, covering disaster-preparedness planning and mitigation of risks and vulnerabilities.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Capacity built to reduce and manage environmental risk • Capacity built to respond to natural disasters at the community level

3.2.3 OVERVIEW OF PROJECTS AND IMPLEMENTATION MODALITIES

Thirty-four development projects in Guyana were funded by the UNDP country office between 2001 and 2008. The country office implemented the largest number of projects during that time period in environment and energy (14 projects), followed by poverty reduction (nine projects), democratic governance (eight projects) and disaster recovery and risk reduction (three projects). The list of environment projects includes the Caribbean Renewable Energy Development Programme (CREDP), which is a regional initiative implemented by CARICOM with Global Environment Facility (GEF) resources for which UNDP Guyana has some performance oversight responsibilities, as well as the multi-country Guiana Shield Initiative (GSI), which has its

project management unit housed in UNDP Guyana Country Office.

The size of projects funded by the Guyana office over the past several years varied widely. The ADR found the majority of projects funded appear to be in the \$300,000-\$500,000 range, with a handful of larger projects ranging from \$800,000 to more than \$2 million, mainly in the environment and democratic governance thematic areas.

The majority of projects (31 out of 34 or approximately 91 percent) used the national execution/implementation (NEX/NIM) modality, which meant they were directly managed by national development partners using funds allocated to them by UNDP. All four direct execution/implementation (DEX/DIM) projects managed

by UNDP itself—two in governance, one in environment and one in disaster recovery—have had much larger budgets (more than \$2 million total) and required more direct, hands-on involvement due to their design.

3.2.4 PROGRAMME EXPENDITURES

Annual programme expenditures for UNDP Guyana in recent years are shown in Table 7 according to information available from the ATLAS corporate accounting system as of June 2009. Noticeable fluctuations in recent annual financial expenditures (for example, a nearly 30 percent drop from 2006 to 2007) appear to be largely attributable to extra infusions of specialized donor resources, which were channeled through the UNDP programme at that time to support the 2006 electoral process, and to challenges with maintaining consistent, diversified flows of non-core resources on a year-by-year basis. The

total expenditure target for the country office is currently set at approximately \$21.5 million for the entire CPD-CPAP period 2006-2010, based on a combination of actual expenditures to date and projected programme expenses for the next two years.

The ADR team was able to obtain some additional project financial information from the country office regarding expenditures on each thematic area in the programme for the entire 2001-2008 period. Unfortunately, none of the information from the early 2000s is contained in the corporate ATLAS system, which has only been in place since 2004. This information is shown in Table 8.

Table 9 shows the official financial information available from the UNDP ATLAS system on the programme's thematic expenditures since 2004.

Table 7. Annual Programme Expenditures for UNDP Guyana 2004-2008 (USD millions)

2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	Total	Annual average
3.05	4.49	6.23	2.29	1.72	17.77	3.55

Table 8. Estimated Total Project Expenditures by Thematic Area for UNDP Guyana 2001-2008³⁷

Thematic area	Number of projects	Total project expenditures
Poverty reduction	9	\$4.5M
Democratic governance	8	\$8.8M
Environment/energy	14	\$9.3M
Disaster recovery and risk reduction	3	\$1.1M

Table 9. Thematic Area Expenditures by UNDP Guyana 2004-2007

Thematic area	Total project expenditures	% of programme spending
Poverty reduction	\$1.9M	11.7
Democratic governance	\$2.7M	17.4
Environment/energy	\$2.3M	14.7
Crisis prevention and recovery ³⁸	\$4.3M	27.2
Not entered (uncoded projects)	\$4.6M	28.85

³⁷ These figures were obtained from the country office in early July 2009 and have been used in the ADR; in comparison to available ATLAS data, which covers a shorter time period and may contain inaccurate project coding, the estimates give a more comprehensive picture of the level of thematic expenditures.

³⁸ Crisis prevention and recovery incorporates both natural disaster projects as well as projects related to prevention of political violence under the democratic governance area.

Unfortunately the available ATLAS data shows a large number of projects as ‘not entered’ under any specific thematic area (perhaps due to errors or misunderstandings in how the data should be coded in the system) so it is not possible to consolidate it accurately with the data shown in Table 8 above.

UNDP Guyana Country Office has relied on external resource mobilization in order to ensure the activities planned under its agreed programming frameworks with the government take place as planned. UNDP, through its corporate budget, has a limited amount of ‘core resources’ available on an annual basis, which it distributes to qualifying programme countries under its target for resource assignment from the core (TRAC) system.³⁹ Recent figures show UNDP Guyana Country Office spent approximately \$1.1 million of TRAC funds in 2004, \$1.2 million in 2005, \$898,000 in 2006, \$594,000 in 2007 and \$568,000 in 2008. It appears that the gradual but consistent decline in UNDP core funds is related to several factors, including the programming and absorptive capacity of the country programme and its partners—if funds are not spent as allocated, then they are reduced accordingly in subsequent years—and the fact that Guyana’s own development status has gradually improved. These funds would obviously not be sufficient on their own to support all planned development

interventions under the CPD-CPAP, given that core funds received from UNDP Headquarters only represented about 30 percent of Guyana Country Office’s total programme expenditures for the 2004-2008 period as listed above. This means that the country programme must raise the bulk of its resources from a variety of non-core sources.

Annual resource mobilization efforts related to raising non-core funds, as well as cost-sharing and fundraising arrangements with the GEF, government and other international partners, accounted for the other 70 percent of funds disbursed by UNDP over the past several years. GEF was the highest single source of external funding, with approximately \$8.17 million allocated to UNDP Guyana from 2001 to 2008. Other major external funders for UNDP work during the past several years included DFID (UK), CIDA (Canada) and the EU. Data available from the country office shows as of mid-2009 approximately \$16.4 million has already been mobilized from non-core funding sources, which represents roughly 76 percent towards the total planned programme expenditures of \$21.5 million for the current CPAP period. The country office predicts another \$875,000 of non-core resources will be mobilized in the next two years, while the remainder of programme funding for this time period will be covered by UNDP core funds.

³⁹ TRAC is based on a system of allocating the funds available to UNDP from its global contributors based on each member country’s income status and development needs.

Chapter 4

UNDP CONTRIBUTION TO DEVELOPMENT RESULTS

4.1 EFFECTIVENESS

The following summarizes the main findings for effectiveness under each thematic area in the country programme. Specific comments and examples are provided on various aspects of effectiveness (progress towards results, mix of projects to support results and impact on vulnerable groups and communities) under each thematic area. Where appropriate, reference is also made to how the country programme evolved in terms of its effectiveness, such as results achievement at either the project and/or programme level, from the CCF to the CPD-CPAP time periods. The ADR team found, in general, strong interlinkages between the different thematic areas during both programme periods that contributed and continues to contribute to overall programme effectiveness and the selection of projects did support overall programmatic results achievement.

Poverty reduction: The ADR found work on poverty and livelihoods contributed to planned country results as well as provided benefits for vulnerable communities and beneficiary groups. Poverty and livelihoods work under the CCF cycle from 2001 to 2005 built on what had been done in the late 1990s with a continued emphasis on community-based poverty reduction work with Amerindian peoples, women and the rural poor (in line with the PRSP-I key objectives and aims as well as UNDP corporate strategy and values). During the CPD-CPAP period the programme continued to evolve, results for poverty reduction were defined differently and there appeared to be attempts to create a better balance between upstream, policy-related work and downstream community initiatives. The ADR identified the main initiatives and their challenges were as follows:

- To strengthen national capacity for poverty eradication, the main activities were oriented towards increasing internal communications and computing capacities of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MoFA) to support PRSP-I monitoring, which was moderately successful. For example draft regional development strategies were produced, detailing the needs and options for localization of economic and social development investments. However, these plans were not actively used. Also, UNDP supported the Bureau of Statistics and the monitoring and evaluation unit in the Office of the President to establish clear benchmarks for measuring poverty reduction. MDG reports produced in the early 2000s were deemed of relatively poor quality, although they did lay the foundation for production of an improved MDG report in 2007 and assisted in the introduction, with UNICEF collaboration, of the DevInfo database for collating vital social and poverty statistics. Strengths of this process included broadly-based, participatory systems for PRSP and social development tracking with extensive tools and manuals produced. The Development of Institutional Social Statistics Capacity (DISSC) project to support social statistics capacity was viewed by the GoG as 'critical' for effective support of PRSP-I monitoring. UNDP support contributed to the availability of better quality statistical information, creation of stronger statistical benchmarks for the monitoring of the PRSP-I, and broader institutional ownership of social data; as well as indirectly contributing to production of an updated national poverty profile, development of a living conditions survey and the implementation of a national household budget survey in 2006. However, since 2007

lead responsibility for MDG/PRSP tracking was officially transferred to the Ministry of Finance (MoF) from the Office of the President and many of these initiatives were discontinued. Building on earlier efforts, a new initiative was being planned with the GoG at the time of the ADR to continue to enhance poverty tracking capacities, building on previous work.

- At the community level the EMPRETEC project from 2003 to 2006 supported small-scale economic development training for local entrepreneurs consistent with the aims of the PRSP-I and NDS. EMPRETEC was very successful in instilling entrepreneurial attitudes and more than 300 entrepreneurs were trained by facilitators from Brazil and Ghana. Training of trainers was also offered in the internationally-recognized EMPRETEC capacity development package.⁴⁰ However the ADR was told by key stakeholders, both inside and outside government, the EMPRETEC project itself ended too abruptly (in spite of a very positive performance review) to capitalize on its potential to influence policies and structures related to women and entrepreneurship.
- Several smaller-scale, downstream initiatives in community-based poverty reduction experienced challenges with linking their effects to broader policy reform aims, which compromised overall project effectiveness. Also there appeared to be consistent challenges with UNDP monitoring itself during the project implementation process to ensure challenges were properly addressed. One example was a partnership between the Ministry of Amerindian Affairs and a European agribusiness company, Amazon Caribbean Ltd., to create 200 acres of manicol palm plantations on a pilot basis in 12 Amerindian riverine communities in Region 1, with the aim of generating economic

opportunities for hinterland communities. In spite of being officially deemed a success, the ADR discovered concrete economic benefits were not yet realized from this initiative several years after it officially ended. A second example was UNDP provided funding for a National Working Group of key private sector representatives (including members from the Private Sector Commission and the Guyana Manufacturers' Association) to identify and sponsor small-scale, micro-enterprise initiatives to support the achievement of the MDG. Results included establishment of a women's agro-processing enterprise in Region 1 that has recently begun to market its products nationally, however the women's group remained severely constrained by lack of marketing expertise. A third example was the mixed results achieved so far in the Replicable Local Poverty Linkages project funded by UNDP since 2007 and implemented by the Ministry of Local Government. The primary objective of this program was to reverse the economic damage of the 2005 floods by supporting work on sustainable livelihoods at the grassroots level. Several small-scale poverty subprojects were supported, but the ADR team found examples of at least two community initiatives launched under the Replicable Local Poverty Linkages that appeared to have major design and implementation flaws.

- HIV-AIDS was included in the original CPD document under the poverty reduction thematic area, but it was not included in the CPAP at the request of the government as the perception was that there was no need for direct UNDP involvement due to the availability of resources from other agencies. However, the ADR learned from various stakeholders that the actual and potential role of UNDP in HIV/AIDS work did not seem to have been fully discussed and clarified either within the UN theme group or even

⁴⁰ EMPRETEC is a global programme of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD), which has been in existence since 1998. It has been launched in 27 countries and trained more than 120,000 entrepreneurs.

with government counterparts before concurring with the decision to exclude HIV/AIDS from the CPAP. Under UNDP corporate mandate, UNDP must remain active in country-level HIV/AIDS mainstreaming activities. This can include support for ensuring that HIV/AIDS is mainstreamed in the PRSP and other national policies/frameworks and within UNDP projects in all sectors. UNDP is also encouraged to play an active technical support and advisory role in terms of integration of gender issues into HIV/AIDS at the country level. In lieu of direct programmatic engagement, UNDP remained involved in some technical support activities and was an active member of the joint UN theme group (and related technical working group) on HIV/AIDS in Guyana during the time period under review. Since 2004 UNDP administered approximately \$500,000 from the specialized Programme Acceleration Funds, which are available via UNAIDS to support small-scale projects to reinforce the national HIV response. The use of these funds was decided jointly by the UN theme group. However, in spite of the clear corporate agreement on a global level between the two agencies, there also appeared to be a need for more consistent dialogue between UNDP and UNAIDS in Guyana regarding how to mutually strengthen each other's role in HIV/AIDS related work and establish the most effective practical working relationship.

- A planned outcome under the CPD related to trade policies was eventually dropped from the CPAP due to the decision by GoG not to pursue the development of regional development strategies as part of the Replicable Local Poverty Linkages project.

Democratic governance: UNDP work on democratic governance beginning in the early 2000s was based on continued involvement at the request of government in supporting national elections and ongoing dialogue concerning how to strengthen the country's governance structures. Several specific projects over both programme cycles had some success in meeting their planned

results. However, the ADR found UNDP work under the CCF was somewhat limited in scope in comparison to the original plans outlined in the CCF document at the start of the programme period, possibly due to changes in the programme context including shifting government priorities and needs. UNDP work in democratic governance did not expand dramatically from the CCF to CPD-CPAP periods although the Social Cohesion Programme (SCP) did make some contributions to national unity and dialogue. The main initiatives were as follows:

- The CCF document, which was jointly agreed with the government, clearly indicated UNDP planned to help support the ongoing constitutional reform process and it specifically mentioned the possibility of institutional development of the Race Relations Commission (later renamed as the Ethnic Relations Commission) as a means of consensus-building. However the ADR team uncovered no direct evidence of UNDP capacity support for this body, although there was continuing support for the Guyana Elections Commission (GECOM) and for the conduct of the 2001 and 2006 elections.
- UNDP funded GECOM from the early 2000s to the present. This involved ongoing support for GECOM IT and data management systems so election results, voter registration systems and maintenance of voter lists were less likely to be disputed. UNDP provided effective technical support for GECOM in the preparation and conduct of the 2006 elections, which included co-funding the Media Monitoring Unit (MMU) with CIDA. During the elections the Guyana media received orientation to international standards for electoral reporting from the MMU, which helped minimize ethnic and political violence. Since the elections, with UNDP support, the MMU continued to help reduce the number of violent images in the print media and support a broader movement towards a national code of practice for journalists.

- UNDP took an effective diplomatic, leadership and facilitation role in the 2006 electoral process, which some observers believed helped ensure these elections unfolded without major incidents of interethnic violence or unrest for the first time in many years. The UNDP Resident Representative (RR) at that time had strong political diplomacy skills and consequently won the respect and admiration of many stakeholders both within and outside the Guyanese government. To contribute towards electoral peace as well as underlying issues, UNDP RR helped negotiate the terms of a 2005 joint memorandum of understanding for electoral support between the Americans, British, Canadians and the EU and the GoG. The elections memorandum of understanding (MOU) was very strategic in that it emphasized certain conditions for enhanced and coordinated multi-donor electoral support based on many key recommendations made by the Commonwealth Secretariat following the violent 2001 elections, and it explicitly identified the need for long-term follow-up to address structural issues linked to the Herdmanston and St. Lucia agreements. A temporary elections unit was established within UNDP country office to administer and coordinate funds from the main international partners under the MOU. However, broader follow-up items in terms of constitutional reform were not pursued by UNDP and key stakeholders once the election itself was over, possibly because the RR had departed by that time.
- To directly support national consensus-building, both in relation to the electoral process and more broadly, UNDP initiated the SCP in 2004 continuing until 2006. The SCP was a DEX project due to its sensitive nature, which involved extensive planning and consultation with experts from the Office of Humanitarian Affairs, the Department of Political Affairs, the Office of the High Commission for Human Rights, and the UNDP Bureau for Crisis Prevention

and Recovery in New York, which formed the so-called 'Framework Team' for global conflict resolution and prevention. The SCP incorporated a wide range of peace-building activities with diverse groups at all levels of society (e.g. local government officials, the Ethnic Relations Commissions, law enforcement officials, political parties and parliamentarians), including workshops, trainings, public presentations, resource-sharing, campaigns and consultations. In 2007 a very thorough evaluation was done of SCP, which judged it to be quite effective and innovative in terms of progress towards its major objectives such as influencing individual, group and social behaviours around democratic dialogue. Strong points included support for peaceful community engagement in the 2006 electoral process and involvement of the private sector in some SCP-supported political consultations. The ADR found evidence of good support offered under the SCP for creation of a comprehensive regional development plan for Region 10, which engaged actors in a developmentally-oriented process both to identify appropriate economic opportunities and to strengthen political/social dialogue. However the SCP evaluation noted that there were some weaknesses in the project, which the ADR team corroborated in its own research, such as its somewhat fragmented approach and its failure to truly build local organizational capacity or sufficiently engage local government structures. The strong focus on individual change in SCP (although commendable and needed) was judged by some key stakeholders to have the effect of distracting attention from the more intensive, challenging work on institutional change in the governance system. The ADR learned that due to the gap between the end of SCP and the launch of its successor project Enhance Public Trust, Security and Inclusion (EPTSI) there were also strong concerns among stakeholders about loss of momentum and continuity.

- As part of non-project support for democratic governance work, since 2004 UNDP has been the co-chair with the Office of the President of a joint governance coordination group that included the major international partners in Guyana. The ADR learned that this was deemed to be an important non-project area of work for UNDP, which is much appreciated by government, and it contributed to increased dialogue between donors and the GoG on what strategies should be used to support national priorities. One major constraint appeared to be that the group did not regularly meet.
- Because of the strong decentralized networks established under SCP with various 'at-risk' communities, UNDP was in a key position to implement the Fast Track Initiative (FTI) following the 2008 community massacres in Bartica and the East Coast of Demerara. The ADR found UNDP was well-regarded for its effort and it was able to play a key role in coordinating inputs from UNICEF and DFID. Effects included some small-scale training and awareness-raising activities, plus trauma counseling for affected families and communities.
- UNDP supported some projects to help strengthen public administration and overall government management, transparency and accountability at all levels. For example, UNDP worked closely with the Ministry of Local Government as a key partner both at the central level and within specific regions for implementation of projects related to the environment, energy and poverty reduction (such as the Replicable Local Poverty Linkages project). Mobilization and training of local communities for poverty alleviation, specifically involving neighbourhood development committees, appeared to have some positive effects on capacity development for local government officials. The ADR also learned that UNDP project support at the central level, both with the Ministry of Local Government and the MoFA in the earlier programme period, evidently increased some planning/oversight and consultation skills and helped break the line ministries' past reliance on foreign consultants. New work is now being planned by UNDP with the MoF to strengthen the aid effectiveness agenda and to increase monitoring capacity, which could be an effective way to further enhance public sector management and accountability systems.
- The ADR found UNDP had a relatively consistent focus on youth as part of its democratic governance work during both programming cycles. Not only did the SCP target vulnerable, at-risk youth in selected areas and engage them in community-based work, but since 2007 a specific initiative was launched on youth and governance with the Ministry of Culture, Youth and Sport, which was also involved in the SCP. It was hoped that some of these youth would also be motivated as a result to participate more actively in local government elections and other forms of community work. However, long-term survival prospects for many of these small-scale community initiatives appeared to be poorly defined.
- Democratic governance work included gender equality and women's leadership. There was a multi-year project to strengthen capacity for gender analysis and documentation in the Women's Affairs Bureau of the Ministry of Labour, Social Services and Social Security (now the Ministry of Human Services and Social Security), which was quite successful. This included support for the establishment of a national Women's Leadership Institute and creation of a national documentation centre for women. The training programs reached a large number of Amerindian women. The consciousness raising initiatives of the Women's Affairs Bureau and other governmental and non-governmental agencies on gender issues were also deemed to have contributed to a significant increase of women parliamentarians, up from 16 percent in the early 2000s to 30 percent now. These UNDP investments were well-planned and

quite cost-effective, in the sense that the work was seamlessly absorbed within the ministry budget and the level of institutional commitment among key partners remains quite high even after the project's end.

- The ADR found UNDP did not support any initiatives for the reform of national judicial systems as originally planned under the CPD-CPAP after 2006.

Environment and energy: UNDP Guyana made some useful contributions to national results in the environment and energy area, and there were several examples of projects that contributed to raising awareness and building capacity on natural resource and biodiversity management. The scope and variety of programming in the environment thematic area (as a proportion of the total country programme) increased over time, indicating both its emerging importance in Guyana and the ability of UNDP to respond and adapt accordingly, for example, in relation to emerging government interest in renewable energy issues that emerged between the early and middle 2000s. UNDP focus on support for biodiversity issues also changed in response to emerging needs. The major initiatives and challenges were as follows:

- To support human resource capacity development, a project implemented by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) in the early 2000s conducted numerous training workshops to build individual knowledge and awareness on environmental topics for EPA personnel, the Guyana Forestry Commission and other environment-related agencies. This supported some useful institutional capacity development, which has continued to the present. Early sensitization activities also included awareness-raising in Amerindian communities, which made them more aware of their key role in environmental protection and promotion of understanding among both government and communities regarding the value of broad-based, participatory consultations regarding environmental issues. The ADR learned over time this

led to increased recognition among policy makers of the need to consult with affected communities, as witnessed by the extensive consultations currently taking place around the LCDS. According to some stakeholders, this was also effective in assisting many hinterland communities to become stronger advocates for local environmental management practices.

- Several ongoing areas of support under the UNDP country programme were for improved biodiversity management, continuous institutional strengthening of the EPA, and capacity building for sustainable land management (SLM). UNDP support to the EPA in assessing its capacities, and those of other government agencies, to undertake this work appeared to be highly effective as a contribution to broader national environmental aims. The ADR found institutional capacity building had a cumulative effect over several years, but there was a need for continued EPA support to further enhance its capacities. For SLM, an umbrella project was designed to mainstream it into national development strategies and processes and into land use planning at national and local levels, assess land degradation in Guyana, and train relevant agencies in early warning systems. The ADR found the project to be highly relevant and quite effective in meeting short-term aims with a good likelihood of having long-term positive effects.
- To respond to a number of emerging issues related to the environment in the early 2000s, which went beyond individual awareness-raising and training, a large UNDP-funded umbrella project to build natural resource management capacity began in 2003 and lasted for approximately five years. It included approximately 18-20 smaller initiatives to address many different dimensions of human resources and (to a lesser extent) organizational capacity building. This project was cited frequently during the ADR research by different partners in the GoG

as a highly effective example of UNDP work. An evaluation done in 2007 found the project produced a number of targeted catalytic effects, although so widely scattered it possibly compromised effectiveness. For example, one subproject with the Ministry of Amerindian Affairs in North Rupupuni produced a strong model for community-led environmental stewardship and led to the establishment of natural resource management bylaws for these communities. This was linked to the earlier successful establishment of the North Rupununi District Development Board, which was in part as a result of UNDP assistance to the Iwokrama International Centre for Rainforest Conservation, which ended in 2001.⁴¹ This was the first such regulatory framework for Amerindian lands in the country and many stakeholders said that it had and still has the potential to be more widely replicated elsewhere.

- Work in North Rupununi since the late 1990s provided an important springboard for UNDP Guyana and the programme's subsequent focus on biodiversity conservation and support for Amerindian communities' involvement in sustainable natural resource management, which emerged strongly in the early to mid-2000s. Another noteworthy initiative to strengthen community engagement and consultation in support of both human resources capacity and hinterlands livelihoods was a highly visible marine turtle conservation effort in Region 1. This was intended to provide alternate ecotourism income for local Amerindian communities, in partnership with the Guyana Marine Turtle Conservation Society. The ADR team found that many thought this had been quite effective in ensuring the local

communities took full ownership of natural resource protection, although more technical support is evidently needed over time for the communities to achieve sustainable livelihoods.

- The ADR found UNDP helped increase Guyana's ability to access GEF resources and create the appropriate institutional structures for the GoG to fulfil its obligations under the UN Convention on Biodiversity (UNCBD) and the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC). Targeted support via UNDP GEF turned out to be particularly strategic in laying the groundwork for the LCDS. In 1999 UNDP supported the development of the country's first National Biodiversity Strategy, which later served as the foundation for the National Biodiversity Action Plan II for 2007-2011 and was approved by the Cabinet of the GoG in August 2008. A national GEF committee was established as well with UNDP technical support. Without this strategic input, both financial and technical, international reporting obligations would likely not have been met by the government. The ADR team learned UNDP Guyana acted successfully as a broker bringing information and opportunities related to the GEF to the attention of the GoG. However, one GEF proposal prepared for submission by UNDP government partners was later determined to be ineligible for funding. This appeared to indicate the need for UNDP Guyana to be better informed about continually-changing GEF eligibility criteria so that it could offer appropriate technical advice on government proposals.⁴² Another is that there was no formal institutional mechanism or forum via which international partners

⁴¹ The ADR team learned the consultations that were undertaken during the process leading to the establishment of the Iwokrama reserve in the late 1990s, which was largely facilitated by UNDP, helped provide the indigenous communities with a model of how consultations with government could be effectively undertaken. This process also fed into the development of the current Amerindian Act.

⁴² In another case, the GoG asked UNDP to take a rejected protected areas project forward in its own UNDP GEF portfolio once the World Bank determined it could not proceed with the project. UNDP considered doing so but found out belatedly that its own quota in that area of the GEF had been reached. The GoG is now pursuing this possibility with the IDB, something that the UNDP office was unaware of until the ADR team brought it to their attention.

and the GoG met regularly to discuss coordination around environment sector support including issues arising regarding ongoing GEF support.⁴³ The ADR team also noted GEF financing represented quite a large proportion of the total resources deployed over the past several years in environment work, which may present some risks for the programme in terms of over-reliance on one funder.⁴⁴

- Due to rising energy prices, the need to reduce Guyana's dependency on fossil fuels, and the importance of supporting economic development in poor hinterland areas through electrification initiatives as outlined in the PRSP-I, renewable energy issues became more prominent in the UNDP country programme after 2004. Main UNDP involvement was via the Hinterlands Renewable Energy project, which began in the mid-2000s with the Office of the Prime Minister. It was designed to support small-scale demonstration projects for electrification of hinterland communities using renewable energy. The ADR discovered this project was deemed effective by both government and community partners, but because it was designed as a demonstration project the overall scale of impact was small and there were numerous technical challenges. There appeared to be a lack of consistent oversight from both UNDP and the government implementing partners to critically analyze the source of project delays and challenges, as well as a poor attention to community consultation to ensure lessons were extracted and then built on.
- Since the early 2000s UNDP also supported CREDP, a large regional project implemented by the CARICOM Secretariat with GEF support that was started under the CCF and continued under the CPF-CPAP. In general, the ADR found UNDP Guyana Country Office had a largely 'hands-off' role with CARICOM in terms of direct planning and oversight for CREDP. However the country office was a member of the CREDP project steering committee so there was some accountability for developmental performance of the project, which had been only moderately effective so far in achieving results (partly due to project redesign). In the view of the ADR team, CREDP created some additional management challenges for the country office in that it was only tangentially linked to the Guyana programme and it had also experienced some implementation delays. CREDP has had some positive effects on regional energy policy and it assisted with development of a national energy policy framework that could potentially be applied in Guyana.
- In 2006 UNDP Guyana became involved as executing agency in an important regional initiative; GSI was intended to address issues such as resource valuation, benefit sharing, monitoring of forests and biodiversity via building local and national capacity.⁴⁵ The Iwokrama Rainforest Centre—a former UNDP-supported initiative, as noted above—is the pilot site for Guyana although the ADR team was informed that the resources deployed thus far appeared to be insufficient to support their continued involvement.⁴⁶ Although it is too soon to tell, it is hoped the project can contribute to catalyzing a 'futures market' for ecosystem

⁴³ The ADR team learned there is a National Climate Committee, which regularly meets, but there is evidently no body which focuses on broader environment issues.

⁴⁴ The ADR team was unable to independently verify the exact proportion of GEF resources used in the environment/energy thematic area over the past several years, but a figure of approximately 69 percent was shared with the team by the country office based on their own calculations.

⁴⁵ UNDP supported the Guiana Shield Conservation Priority Setting workshop in the early 2000s, which led to the Paramaibo Declaration in 2002.

⁴⁶ There are two financial agreements between UNDP and Iwokrama Centre, one related to developing a benefit-sharing mechanism and another related to pilot site monitoring activities.

services, as long as UNDP can forge stronger synergies between the regional initiative and what is happening at both the national and local levels.

Disaster recovery and risk reduction: The ADR found UNDP made very useful contributions to country objectives and priorities in disaster management. This included support for both short-term response to emergency situations and longer-term aims to reduce Guyana's vulnerability to climate change and rising sea levels via working with key bodies such as the Civil Defence Commission (CDC) and National Drainage and Irrigation Authority to plan and prioritize strategies for effective drainage systems. The main trends and issues related to work on disaster recovery and risk reduction by UNDP were as follows:

- In late 2002 UNDP started preparations for a planned project to assist the GoG to prepare a comprehensive disaster management strategy for Guyana. This was linked to a regional UNDP-sponsored project with the Caribbean Disaster and Emergency Response Agency (CDERA)⁴⁷ of CARICOM to encourage all member states to create these plans using a standardized model. At that time, UNDP Guyana using its background analysis helped identify key challenges in Guyana with institutional arrangements and capacities related to disaster response and management as well as the need to move beyond a reactive, crisis-driven approach to more concerted action to address disaster vulnerabilities. Following this process UNDP worked with the GoG to prepare a project proposal for a two-year project (2003-2005) to support the Office of the President and the CDC to implement the draft strategy and put in place systems to support it. Plans included institutional capacity development with lead agencies and government line ministries as well as consultative processes with communities likely to
- UNDP in close conjunction with other international partners including the Inter-American Development Bank (IDB) was involved in planning for a comprehensive new project to strengthen local and national capacities for disaster response and risk reduction. The project will support an update of the previous draft comprehensive disaster management strategy from 2003, which UNDP helped fund; an update of emergency response and flood response plans; plus extensive capacity development for the CDC. This represents a commendable upstream approach regarding effective natural disaster response as well as policies and frameworks linked to prevention such as enforcement of policies on land use. After some delays, UNV recruitment took place in 2009 to provide technical support for this project. A comprehensive capacity assessment of key government agencies was conducted during the inception phase of the project, which appeared to be a very effective approach.
- UNDP supported the post flood recovery and reconstruction process in Guyana starting in March 2005. This was a directly implemented project to access special emergency funds from UNDP headquarters with technical support from the Office of Humanitarian Affairs. The ADR team found UNDP and other international agencies were concerned at the time about the fragility of government institutions and systems underlying the flood relief process, as little work had been accomplished on this previously. The emergency project covered mobilization of extra resources to support livelihood recovery. Funding was provided for a temporary programme officer for disaster management

⁴⁷ As of September 2009, the name of CDERA was officially changed to the Caribbean Disaster Emergency Management Agency (CDEMA).

housed in the UNDP office to help coordinate the multi-agency response to the floods. UNDP supported an immediate post-flood socio-economic disaster damage assessment done by UNECLAC, which proved to be very effective for analyzing the extent of the damage and the possible options for reconstruction and rehabilitation. It was completed in late March 2005.⁴⁸

- UNDP continued to be involved in the 2005 flood recovery efforts and was able to mobilize sufficient additional emergency funds from UN headquarters to provide both financial and material support to farmers affected by the disaster. The ADR team learned that UNDP support enabled some farmers to replant following the floods and they received training on how to avoid seed loss in future floods. UNDP evidently contributed to greater coordination between CDC and government line ministries than in the past regarding natural disaster responses, and it helped support development of a preliminary water level management plan.

4.2 EFFICIENCY

Managerial efficiency: The main issues looked at by the ADR team were whether projects were executed within reasonable deadlines and budgets, and whether prompt or timely actions were taken to identify and respond to challenges encountered in implementation. Another sub-area was also whether the administrative and managerial demands placed on partners were reasonable, in relation to the agreed-upon need to increase government ownership of UNDP-supported projects.

On the positive side, UNDP Guyana displayed good managerial efficiencies in many crisis situations: responding rapidly to the 2005 flood relief, 2006 electoral support, and the 2008 FTI. Especially noteworthy was the 2005

flood response, in which UNDP was able to effectively mobilize considerable emergency resources within a period of only a few weeks. The FTI was launched very quickly under the umbrella of the SCP, drawing on many of the same communities, networks and resource people involved in the earlier project to facilitate a rapid response. Another good example of implementation efficiency, which could possibly be replicated if the lessons were extracted, was a major umbrella project to build natural resource management capacity from 2003 to 2008 that was implemented by the MoFA in the environment/energy thematic area. The project was able to achieve all its major outputs within the planned timeframe with fewer resources than anticipated, which meant that additional resources became available for extra work under a project extension.

However the ADR found one major efficiency challenge for the programme overall, which was consistent delays that led to numerous project extensions due to the rate at which the funds could be disbursed and used by partners. At project start-up there were sometimes challenges with timely approval by key government stakeholders, coupled with the need for extensive negotiations required with government around 'sensitive' interventions. Although the scope of consultation among key stakeholders in the conceptualization and design of most UNDP-funded projects was found to be highly commendable (given the need to focus on government ownership), the trade-offs included loss of momentum, situations where the original design was no longer relevant by the time the project was approved, and declining enthusiasm among partners and community-based beneficiaries.

UNDP Guyana was seen by partners as largely 'hands-off' in terms of reporting and other requirements, which evidently did help increase government ownership of initiatives to some extent. Government implementing agencies appreciated UNDP flexibility in terms of project exten-

⁴⁸ See UNDP Guyana/UNECLAC, 'Guyana: Socio-Economic Assessment of the Damages and Losses Caused by the January-February 2005 Flooding,' March 2005.

sions and/or adaptations to the original objectives or design. However because UNDP reporting and implementation demands were so flexible, the ADR learned that in the past there appeared to be challenges with timely reporting as well as with identification of and response to emerging challenges, human resource shortages or changing circumstances in the partner agencies that negatively affected projects. In the view of the ADR team, this could be related to either unrealistic planning (e.g. over-ambitious goal setting) on the part of UNDP and its partners, or insufficient joint assessment with implementing agencies regarding their project management capacity or lack thereof. On the positive side, UNDP country office over the past two years has made efforts to increase the efficiency of project implementation through instituting more regular meetings and consultations with government partners to jointly strategize about overcoming implementation delays.

These were some other aspects of managerial efficiency and related internal challenges and advances noted by the ADR which will be elaborated more in the programme management (see Section 4.4.).

Programme efficiency: The ADR looked at the strategic concentration and prioritization of planned activities, their relationship to results achievement and sustainability, leveraging or rationalization of resources, and the degree to which UNDP efforts were spread too thin, leading to overburdening of staff or resources.

Overall, the ADR found that the Guyana country programme used available resources in an appropriate manner to help achieve planned results both within the country programme as well as in relation to broader national priorities. UNDP Guyana made efforts over time to rationalize distribution of resources according to the priority needs of the country and to increase government ownership of initiatives, as well as to analyze resource trends, reallocate resources and anticipate and plan for resource needs as necessary in a responsive manner. These trends were not as visible prior to the CPD-CPAP period but

became much more prominent since 2006. For example, the majority of projects selected for funding were usually carefully linked to overall priorities identified in consultation with government. The cluster of projects supported under each thematic area were not usually selected at random, but were designed (in theory at least) to be part of a larger framework for development change. Resources appeared to be used pragmatically and efficiently to produce reasonable benefit. In the poverty reduction area, for example, by targeting both downstream efforts that produced concrete benefits for hinterland communities as well as upstream efforts that were linked to poverty-monitoring issues. However, the ADR was concerned these two areas of work were not always linked as consistently and efficiently as they might have been and a great deal of effort in the programme appeared to be focused on implementation of small-scale, downstream projects (mainly at the request of government and other key stakeholders).

However, on the plus side, UNDP Guyana country programme created useful interconnections and efficiencies between discrete initiatives across different thematic areas, in order to share resources, analysis and information. Several good examples were found of where several projects in the environment and energy sector also helped address and reinforce poverty reduction aims for isolated Amerindian communities. Another example was that some poverty reduction efforts drew on the same local leaders and resource people as in democratic governance projects, which allowed for efficient cooperation and leveraging of technical inputs between the stakeholders. Finally, it should be noted that by concentrating its work across several thematic areas in two or three regions of the country (mostly Regions 1, 9 and 5), various efficiencies appeared to be achieved for the programme in that expertise, partnerships and strategies were shared either formally or informally to enhance project performance and implementation. However, there were the only two projects in the environment and energy portfolio that entailed collaborating NGOs despite the evidence worldwide that partnering with both governments

and civil society is the most efficient approach to conservation.

4.3 SUSTAINABILITY

Design for sustainability: Positive examples of sustainability in the UNDP Guyana programme included EMPRETEC, which started as a project but continued as an NGO when the project ended. Those initially trained under the project formed an association of entrepreneurs that has helped continue to motivate its members towards small business development in the country. Also, investments made in the Women's Leadership Institute by UNDP in the early 2000s appeared to be very sustainable and cost-efficient, possibly because cost-sharing and hand-over with the government partner ministry were well-formulated as part of the project design. Good sustainability in terms of longer-term institutional strengthening was noted in several environment projects. For example, there has been ongoing support for the CDC and the Ministry of Agriculture in setting up stronger institutional structures for an early warning mechanism for flood disasters, an effort which has been ongoing over several projects. Assistance provided to the Amerindian communities of the Northern Rupununi in the establishment of local resource management plans and community organizations resulted in structures that have continued to function after many years, and which could be widely replicated throughout the country if appropriate follow-up was offered.

The UNDP Guyana programme was found to have some major weaknesses in terms of designing individual project efforts for longer-term sustainability. This was partly a function of the challenging and highly adaptive programming environment, but also demonstrated how sustainability planning had to be built into the design and ongoing implementation of each initiative. Many poverty reduction efforts appeared to be focused on small-scale, one-off infusions of resources instead of a more strategic long-term approach to organizational development. For example, many stakeholders interviewed for the ADR expressed

strong concerns that sustainability was compromised because the amounts allocated to some small-scale, short-term rural economic and livelihood projects under the Heart of Palm, SCP, FTI, and Replicable Local Poverty Linkages projects were simply inadequate in size or too short-term in comparison to the scope of needs and therefore unlikely to have lasting effects. This approach meant that continuous reinvestment needed to be made in the same area to produce results or effects over time. For example, the ADR team saw and heard about several small-scale initiatives under the Replicable Local Poverty Linkages and the SCP-related FTI that did not appear to have adequate plans in place to produce sustainable local enterprises, although they did meet other aims related to consensus-building in marginalized rural areas. A craft production enterprise started in Region 5 under the Replicable Local Poverty Linkages flourished while UNDP funds flowed in for several months, but collapsed as soon as the funds dried up as there was no technical support available from the implementing agency and poor diagnosis of longer-term beneficiary issues and needs. Likewise, technical problems encountered in the Heart of Palm and hinterland energy projects were not promptly addressed. In the case of working with vulnerable youth on small-scale economic initiatives through poverty reduction and democratic governance projects, there did not appear to be any attention paid to the long-term policy dimensions related to access to vocational training for young people in high-risk rural areas to enhance sustainability. Another sustainability challenge observed in the democratic governance area was the relatively long timelag (according to some observers) between the end of the SCP and the launch of the follow-up project, leading to cessation of some earlier community initiatives and loss of momentum among partners.

Sustainability of other UNDP-supported work appeared to be compromised by the lack of core resources within government partner institutions. UNDP invested heavily for several years in strengthening the monitoring unit in the Office of the President, but this unit was later disbanded. Key personnel took posts outside of

government, capacity then had to be rebuilt from scratch in the MoF—a process that is still ongoing. In spite of considerable investments made in building capacity for MDG monitoring, there still appeared to be challenges with timely data dissemination, effective use of data in evidence-based planning and the extent to which data systems were being actively maintained and used. Another example was the statisticians paid for by UNDP under the DISSC project were not able to be absorbed into government as planned, so these posts were eliminated or trained personnel left to take other jobs.

Scaling up of pilot initiatives: Replication or scale-up of UNDP-funded effects and changes appeared to be limited. In many cases, the basic ideas were sound but due to technical problems and/or lack of timely follow-up, the original vision for broader application was not pursued. In the hinterland the renewable energy project, sustainability and wider replication so far were found to be compromised by lack of community consultation, limited use of appropriate technology, and poor systematic learning and reflection by the implementing partners on which to build replication. Most important, little analysis was done by UNDP or its implementing partners of the key policy barriers to effective commercialization and replication of small-scale rural energy alternatives.. In several to-build regulatory capacities for the environment sector, the ADR team

observed there was a need to move from the process of assessing and/or building the basic regulatory instruments towards actual implementation, follow-up and scaled-up enforcement. Other challenging examples found were the inability to sustain or replicate school environment clubs under the EPA-implemented environment awareness project. There was also poor use of the assessment that was conducted with GEF funds of the country’s capacity in three critical areas (biodiversity conservation, climate change and land degradation). However, it should be noted that the action plan currently being prepared by the EPA with UNDP GEF assistance may help in translating the assessment into an action-oriented tool.

4.4 COUNTRY PROGRAMME MANAGEMENT

Corporate programme management indicators: According to information obtained by the ADR team in June 2009 from the UNDP corporate ‘balanced scorecard,’ the UNDP Guyana country programme either achieved its planned targets or remained within ‘acceptable’ range for its main management indicators since 2004. The key indicators related to measuring programme management, reviewed by the ADR team and their values are summarized in Table 10. The main problems noted were with the management efficiency ratio indicator and with implementation of joint programmes.

Table 10. UNDP Guyana Balanced Scorecard Report Summary 2004-2007

Selected indicator	2004-2008 average value and unit	Corporate performance rating (2008)
Annual targets achieved	82.23 (index)	Within acceptable range
Programme expenditure ratio within development focus areas	85.65 (percentage)	Target achieved
Management efficiency ratio	21.87 (percentage)	Target missed
Financial data quality	1.00 (index)	Target achieved
Joint programmes	1 (number)	Target missed
Cost recovered from programme country cost sharing	4.67 (percentage)	Target achieved
Cost recovered from trust funds and third-party cost sharing	3.6 (percentage)	Target achieved
Programme expenditures	3.5M (\$)	Target missed
Non-core resources mobilized	4.8M (\$)	Within acceptable range

Human resources and internal country office capacity: Currently UNDP Guyana Country Office has approximately 30 personnel under the leadership of a RR and Deputy Resident Representative. The country office team includes permanent, contract and project-related staff members. Prior to 2003, there were few professional staff members and they all provided collective oversight for the main thematic areas in the programme. After 2003, the management structure for the country office was reorganized to reflect increasing specialization in the programme and to create dedicated staffing clusters for each thematic area, staffing levels also gradually increased. For example, a combined analyst/programme officer position for environment/energy was designated at the time while another analyst covered both poverty reduction and democratic governance. A poverty reduction analyst/consultant and a monitoring and evaluation officer were recently added to increase the amount of specialized expertise in the country programme. These initiatives indicate the commitment by the country office to gradually increasing human resource capacity so that the programme can be managed as effectively and efficiently as possible.⁴⁹ However some stakeholders and partners interviewed for the ADR noted that one challenge in the past has been the lack of sustained contact with UNDP staff members in some cases, which they attributed to heavy demands on key individuals in the country office.

The ADR learned that there was an increase in opportunities for learning, ongoing performance review and critical reflection activities among the country programme personnel since 2007. These included more active engagement among the programme team and with country partners to discuss strengths and weaknesses of UNDP work, as well as review ongoing progress via weekly programme staff meetings. However, country programme staff members

said they would welcome more opportunities in the future for critical internal dialogue, reflection and brainstorming on performance and management issues due to the complex challenges faced by the programme.

Country office leadership: All main observers in Guyana interviewed by the ADR team, both in government and with the lead international partner agencies, stated strong concerns that what they perceived as the high turnover in the RR position had undermined effective leadership and strategic oversight of the UNDP country programme over the past several years. This concern was also shared internally by key senior staff members. Even though the RR role is not responsible for day-to-day management of the programme, this position ‘sets the tone’ and inspires the morale and direction of UNDP work as a whole.

Articulation of results and results framework: UNDP approach to results-based management (RBM) for the Guyana programme has positively evolved over time. During the CCF period the programme results were broadly defined—there was no formal results framework and the outcomes were not stringently monitored for a specified period. In the current CPD-CPAP period, there is a formal results framework jointly agreed with government, which has been updated via a CPAP mid-term review process conducted in 2008. Another positive development was that a RBM action plan was also prepared for the country programme in 2008, leading to a RBM training workshop for country office personnel. Programme staff also completed an online project management certification course in 2008. There will soon be a follow-up RBM workshop conducted with all UNDP implementing partners to build their capacity in planning, results-based implementation, monitoring and risk assessment for individual projects and eventually, it is hoped, support improved and more efficient programme

⁴⁹ According to information shared with the ADR team during the finalization of the report, since late 2008 the country office has recruited six new professional staff members and associates in the country programme team and one additional professional in the operations area.

implementation under the current CPAP. This will also lay the foundation for enhanced results-based planning and implementation of the next CPD-CPAP cycle starting in 2011-2012.

In spite of these recent improvements, the ADR team found that in the past, lack of precision and clarity in results formulation at both the programme and project level greatly affected measurability of results. For example, an expected outcome in the CPD-CPAP in the environment/energy thematic area was stated as: “Contribution of biodiversity and ecosystem services to food security, health, livelihoods and reduced vulnerability to natural disasters factored into national planning for achievement of development goals, including safeguards to protect these resources.” The ADR team found this type of statement to hold little value from a results-management perspective. But the increased training and orientation on RBM for the country office and its partners, which is currently underway, should help create stronger results frameworks in the future.

Workplanning and reporting: The CPAP process was introduced at a corporate level in the mid-2000s and involved extensive stakeholder consultation in the design and ongoing work planning, reporting and outcome review process for the current UNDP country programme framework. The ADR found in the past, Annual Work Plans (AWPs) were not in place for all projects at the beginning of each year, and the quality and scope of project reporting was weak. For example, in the early to mid-2000s, many projects did not produce timely close-out reports and reporting at the programme level tended to focus on activities or outputs rather than outcomes. Starting in 2008, the country office began to regularize this process, ensuring that AWPs with related results framework, targets and budgets were jointly signed off by UNDP and implementing partners promptly at the start of each programme year to expedite timely budget disbursements and provide a structure for

subsequent performance review and reporting.

UNDP Guyana will move soon to establish ‘outcome boards’ for CPAP monitoring and conduct outcome-level evaluations as recommended corporately, combined with improved harmonization of partner reporting requirements with corporate results oriented annual reports. The ADR noted this indicated a more decisive move towards a proactive, problem-solving approach to planning and implementation than in the past. Eventually, the ADR learned there will be annual CPAP outcome reviews to assess progress and suggest corrective action towards outcomes jointly with lead partners, but these have not yet taken place. This means that up to now there has been an important gap in the level and quality of information available to guide the country programme as well as individual projects. However, on the plus side, UNDP managers informed the ADR team that quarterly meetings had recently started with the MoF to review progress in all active projects, sensitize partners around outcome and performance issues, and identify corrective actions needed or any follow-up technical requirements, which will include UNCT representatives. This is intended to strengthen work planning and reporting processes, as well as broader results management, at the strategic and policy review between UNDP and government ministries, so that dialogue with partners about programme efficiency and effectiveness is not just at the implementation level.

Monitoring and evaluation: The ADR learned UNDP Guyana recognized the need to provide greater monitoring and capacity building support to nationally implemented projects as well as to the programme overall, so the new monitoring and evaluation officer is likely to be a strategic addition. Efforts have also been made in the last two years by programme managers to improve monitoring and evaluation according to corporate guidelines, although as previously noted so far no outcome-level evaluations were conducted.⁵⁰ However there was a CPAP mid-term review in 2008 that

⁵⁰ UNDP evaluation policy requires the conduct of outcome evaluations during the programme cycle.

involved all the main national stakeholders and identified specific areas for improvement. The findings from this were being actively used at the time of the ADR to implement specific improvements. There was a small number of third-party, independent evaluations of complex or risk-prone projects commissioned by UNDP Guyana over the past several years, but the quality of these was highly variable. In the past there may have been insufficient specialized technical expertise in monitoring and evaluation in the country office to provide effective guidance for these evaluations. Neither was there a comprehensive programme monitoring and evaluation strategy in earlier phases of the programme, which might have formed the basis for critical, learning-oriented dialogue with project implementing partners. This gap will hopefully be addressed soon by the new monitoring and evaluation officer.

The ADR found the country office was also aware of the need to increase quality assurance of projects through more regular performance monitoring. This was shown, for example, by the assignment of two individuals within the project team to conduct ongoing quality assurance for the new EPTSI project. In the past, the high costs and complex logistics associated with traveling to remote areas in the country prevented regular visits to widely-scattered project locations. The ADR team identified numerous concerns regarding lack of effective follow-up and performance monitoring of individual projects by UNDP Guyana. Under the NEX modality, the responsibility for performance monitoring lies primarily with the implementing partner, which is very sound in theory but only if sufficient capacity development and mentoring is provided. In the opinion of many project partners and beneficiaries, UNDP Guyana had not liaised to help with problem-solving nor had it followed up sufficiently regarding implementation approaches, technical challenges, development problems encountered and the need for prompt remedial action where delays or problems were encountered.

Resource mobilization: As noted earlier in the report, given that approximately 70 percent of

UNDP programme funds must be mobilized on an annual basis from non-core resources, resource mobilization is a crucial aspect of the country office's work. In the CPAP, specific resource mobilization targets were set for each thematic area and then further adjusted based on feedback received from the CPAP mid-term review in 2008, but mobilization of non-core resources on an annual basis has fluctuated a great deal over the past several years for the country programme. In some cases this relates to changing funding priorities of agencies on which UNDP depends for funds, in others it is due to shortfalls in previous funding commitments made. Fluctuations in the amount of funds mobilized by UNDP from year to year greatly influenced the size and number of projects undertaken, and sometimes project design consultations and implementation timelines also had to be extended to take resource shortfalls into account.

According to information provided by the Country Office, the amount of resources mobilized by the programme has increased since 2007 when there was a noticeable dip in the level of programme expenditures, perhaps due to an apparent loss of momentum for fundraising in the country office after the extreme demands of both the 2005 floods and the 2006 elections. The 2008 CPAP review noted more resources were needed to meet programme targets, but the country office informed the ADR team that it was quite confident that these will be met or exceeded. A detailed and well-researched resource mobilization strategy for the UNDP country programme, which is being continuously updated, was initially developed by the country office in early 2008. However there is no doubt that resource mobilization continues to present ongoing challenges for the programme given that it takes considerable time and energy. Most project funding commitments, both core and non-core, are only made on an annual basis, which severely limits the ability of the country programme to plan and implement projects over the long term. The relatively high dependence of UNDP Guyana on GEF as its major source of financing for environment projects presents

a high risk as well for the programme, which will need to be addressed in the future. Finally CIDA and DFID were two bilateral donors who previously offered relatively strong and consistent support to UNDP Guyana, but they are both now moving to a regional programme approach, which will lead to a decrease in the funds available at the country level.

Regional programming: The Guyana Country Office has responsibilities related to regional programming, which both add to and draw on its limited administrative resources. In the case of CREDP, which is implemented by the CARICOM Secretariat, there is some responsibility for development performance on the part of UNDP Guyana. However, the office also receives a proportion of the regional management overheads from GEF to compensate for its involvement. As noted elsewhere, UNDP Guyana also houses the management unit for the regional GSI project, but the ADR team learned the country office received insufficient

overheads from the project funders and it was in fact subsidizing the unit to some extent, a situation that creates a net drain on the country programme resources.

Corporate memory and record keeping: The Guyana Country Office did not have a central record keeping or data management system to serve as both present and historical repository for project and programme-related information. As a result, there were challenges with documentation and corporate memory, which meant the ADR team found it very difficult to easily access information on past projects and accomplishments in the programme and in individual projects, especially prior to 2004 when the ATLAS system was introduced by UNDP corporately. This applied not only to financial data but to information on project design, results achieved, products or deliverables, follow-up done and lessons learned that all could be applied by the country office and its partners in the design of new projects.

STRATEGIC POSITIONING OF UNDP

5.1 STRATEGIC RELEVANCE

Relevance against national development priorities: UNDP programme in Guyana since 2000 has been closely linked to the country's main development priorities as identified in the NDS, the NCS, PRSP-I and, more recently, the LCDS. It has also been linked to evolving trends in ODA and the ongoing UNDAF process since 2000, as outlined in the previous sections. The country programme was also well-aligned with the corporate priorities outlined in the second UNDP Multi-Year Funding Framework for 2004-2007 and UNDP Strategic Plan for 2008-2011.

UNDP was perceived by all stakeholders interviewed for the ADR (government, non-state actors and international agencies) as having provided a 'unifying' influence in the country given that it is an impartial, UN-affiliated agency. UNDP overall strategic relevance was linked not so much to the amount of resources it spent, which was small in comparison to other lead international partners, but its ability to negotiate a common ground between different viewpoints and serve as an 'honest broker' or neutral mediator. This was also linked to its strong strategic partnership role, which will be described in more detail. The ADR team learned that UNDP was very influential and effective in the area of donor coordination, while at the same time maintaining its primary commitment to country ownership of programs and projects. The government itself recognized the importance of this role, for which it gave UNDP high marks particularly in the more sensitive areas of electoral support and conflict resolution.

UNDP was frequently called upon by government and international partners over the past several years to play a convener role in such

key areas as the negotiation of a multi-donor MOU for electoral support in 2006, facilitation of government/donor meetings within various sectors, and discussions pertaining to both aid effectiveness and coordination. Not surprisingly, the ADR found UNDP was regarded as having both diplomatic and developmental roles. These different perspectives recognized the range of UNDP engagement, but there appeared to be some confusion at times among stakeholders (and perhaps occasionally within the UNDP country office itself) about the distinction between the two roles.

UNDP country programme objectives were formulated to support national development aims. One concrete example is that the PRSP-I outlined the need for specific support to Regions 1 and 9, these were two regions of the country where UNDP focused its attention through a combination of both poverty reduction and environment/energy projects. UNDP Guyana supported a number of key initiatives to stimulate economic growth and entrepreneurship (e.g. EMPRETEC), improve community and social cohesion in support of better governance (e.g. SCP), enhance rural electrification (e.g. hinterlands renewable energy project), and link economic growth to stronger management of natural resources (e.g. umbrella projects to develop frameworks for effective land use management and to support Amerindian communities in economic and social development). There was a very high level of consultation and dialogue with key development partners (an important UNDP principle), which meant UNDP was able to adjust its approach to emerging needs and to revise priorities as needed. For example, through foregrounding disaster relief and mitigation as a specific programme thematic area after 2005, as well as by the increasing emphasis placed on the environment and energy sector.

Leveraging the implementation of national strategies and policies: To some extent, UNDP helped to mobilize and coordinate funding from the international community for the PRSP-I and to focus attention on the MDGs on a policy level. It also supported country-wide consultative processes in preparation for the PRSP-I launch and ongoing reports. Another policy dimension, which was a UNDP priority area, was related to GECOM. UNDP attempted to foster stronger private sector engagement in development in support of the NCS and PRSP-I. Several environmental projects strongly supported government policy objectives including support for formulation of the national biodiversity action plan, preparation of the reports to the UNCBD and UNFCCC (funded under UNDP/GEF), and work to phase-out CFCs (funded under the Montreal Protocol). Another key project for capacity building in environmental management responded to a needed amendment of mining regulations. Other work to develop a national disaster management plan and related agency capacities following the 2005 floods was also in response to GoG policy objectives.

However, the main challenge identified by the ADR team was that the implied policy dimensions of UNDP work were not always fully defined. This area was not well-delineated during the planning stage of projects in terms of the specific changes required by government partners where international partners could provide strategic inputs. Also, the immediate demands of relatively short-term, downstream development work appeared to take precedence especially where emergencies arose such as prevention of violence during the 2006 elections and response to the 2005 floods. It appeared the PRSP-I support process (commendable as it was) did not incorporate a very strong policy

leveraging dimension so it was easy for development efforts to be deflected into small-scale, downstream work.

Corporate and comparative strengths of UNDP: The ADR team found that UNDP work in Guyana since the early 2000s was characterized to some extent by a strong capacity development approach. This ranged from successful deployment of a number of UNV in various agencies—a more ‘traditional’ mode of technical gap-filling, which may not have been fully sustainable in some instances—towards a more coherent institutional strengthening approach such as that used with EPA. The ADR team found UNDP was consistently cited by government and international partners as an agency known to support capacity development, mainly via training, workshops and conferences; national support for private sector engagement with the MDG process was catalyzed by a regional UNDP conference on this topic held in Guyana in 2005. More recently, projects that were in the pipeline at the time of the ADR to more fully develop government institutional capacities for aid effectiveness, poverty monitoring, and performance-based budgeting and MDG reporting appeared to indicate strong capacity development approaches were being maintained and built on. It should be noted that the use of UNV in Guyana was crucial at earlier stages because of human resource shortages, but once these individuals left capacity or knowledge was unfortunately not retained.⁵¹ However where national UNV were used (e.g. SCP) the knowledge transfer seemed to be greater. The ADR team also noted that there was recently an improved focus on UNV by UNDP, which promised to align them more closely to the strategic thrust of the overall UNDP programme, something which was not done consistently in the past.⁵²

⁵¹ Unfortunately it was not possible within the timeframe and scope of this ADR to thoroughly evaluate the role of UNV in Guyana. There is also a lack of corporate record-keeping regarding the role and effects of UNV. However, information obtained from the country office indicated approximately 98 UNV were placed in Guyana since 2001, of which 80 were international volunteers. The largest number of volunteers was in the democratic governance area, followed by health, cross-cutting areas and community development support and poverty reduction.

⁵² Issues now under consideration by the new UNV coordinator in the UNDP office include how to measure sustainability of UNV efforts, ensure that UNV placements are closely linked to CPAP outcome achievement and integrate UNV more fully into CPD-CPAP planning in future.

However the ADR found that the overall approach to capacity development used by UNDP Guyana was sometimes not clearly spelled out. Capacity development was often used as a 'catch-all' concept in UNDP work, for which no clear indicators were provided to measure whether meaningful, sustainable institutional transformation at different levels (not just individual capacity) was achieved or maintained. Examples of the discontinued efforts to strengthen monitoring capacity for the MDG and PRSP-I were previously provided, as well as the training and placement of statisticians under the DISCC project. Another, more current example was UNDP work with the Ministry of Local Government as an implementing partner for Replicable Local Poverty Linkages did include some transfer of project management capacity, but the process appeared to be somewhat ad hoc. The ADR found no specific capacity development strategy in use by UNDP Guyana that was tailored to the country's rapidly evolving needs and linked to specific programme interventions. Concerns were raised by some stakeholders that UNDP routinely utilized international consultants to support its work in Guyana without complementing this approach by building the capacity of national players, thereby undermining its stated intent to build national capacity. However, the new project now being planned to build national capacity for natural disaster prevention and management appears to be taking a more systematic and structured approach to capacity development. Also, the new EPSTI project is taking a more comprehensive approach to capacity development with support from the UNDP Capacity Development Group.

Another aspect of UNDP comparative advantage in Guyana, albeit more modest, was several examples of South-South knowledge exchange, including deployment of facilitators on entrepreneurship development from Ghana and Brazil for EMPRETEC, recruitment of facilitators skilled in peace-building from South Africa under the SCP, and limited, although successful, use of in-country exchanges between Amerindian communities in both the environment and

poverty reduction areas. However, there appeared to be further unexploited potential for development of additional South-South exchanges along these lines using a more systematic or planned approach, both within the country and with the wider CARICOM region. There did not appear to be a coherent strategy to guide South-South exchanges.

5.2 RESPONSIVENESS

Responsiveness to changing development needs and priorities: The ADR learned from key national stakeholders that UNDP was very responsive to emerging trends and needs within Guyana. The continued growth of the environment/energy thematic area and its evolution from the CCF era to the present was a demonstration of this. UNDP was well-respected for responding to immediate needs and fostering dialogue around the 2006 electoral process. Another example of good responsiveness: UNDP was able to address emerging human resource gaps around social-statistics capacity development support in relation to a much larger IDB social statistics programme with the Bureau of Statistics, although as previously noted, long-term sustainability was limited.

In the environment thematic area, there was one very strong example found of a responsive project design, which appeared to provide an excellent model for ongoing support but unfortunately was not replicated. The umbrella project with the MoFA for capacity building in environmental management and sustainable use of natural resources was based on funding various subprojects depending on emerging needs and issues. The subprojects were identified not by UNDP but by the representatives of all the government agencies dealing with environment and natural resource management, who all participated on the project steering committee along with UNDP. This approach guaranteed the project was highly responsive to emerging environment priorities. Although a second phase of the project is now being planned, the same design was evidently not applied.

Mechanisms to respond to crisis and emergencies: UNDP Guyana was able to leverage technical and financial resources from the broader UN system quite rapidly in emergency situations. The best examples of good short-term responsiveness included the FTI in 2008 and the 2005 flood emergency response. Other examples of rapid response to emerging issues in the country included the rapid deployment of the ‘framework team’ from UN Headquarters, which provided sound technical advice on conflict resolution in the early 2000s, analytical support on an as-needed basis for the RR and the country programme personnel in the run-up to the 2006 elections, and the special human rights advisors mobilized under the UN Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights. On another level of responsiveness, there was some flexibility built into many interventions, and some planned aspects were either modified or eliminated as the timing dictated. For example, the SCP geared up to include more high-level dialogue between political parties as the 2006 election drew closer. Beyond SCP, the planning of EPTSI in follow-up was a response to similar changing priorities.

5.3 STRATEGIC PARTNERSHIPS

Use of partnerships for development results: The ADR team observed UNDP succeeded in forging a highly cooperative and active partnership with the GoG for the most part. For example, UNDP established several commendable ongoing partnerships for government-level institutional development and/or project implementation with the Office of the President, Ministry of Amerindian Affairs, EPA, Ministry of Local Government and CDC. Partners cited these relationships were mostly well-managed by UNDP. The ADR found that partnerships with government evolved over time when the shift took place from the MoFA as the focal ministry for UNDP to the MoF in the early 2000s, and UNDP partnership approach has continued to evolve in recent years. In the earlier CCF phase, there was a conscious shift towards increased country ownership and leadership in UNDP programming at this time, as the ADR team was

told earlier projects and initiatives, were, to some extent, UNDP-driven.

Later projects and partnerships in the CPD-CPAP period were based on closer engagement at all stages with country stakeholders and the gradual transfer of full responsibility for progress and results to implementing partners. GoG partners admitted this did not take place without challenges due to chronic human resource shortages and gaps in managerial expertise in some partner agencies. For example, at the local government level, the ADR team found UNDP emphasized inclusion of regional and district councils in many projects, especially those focused on empowerment for hinterland areas. However, some local beneficiaries in the hinterland areas stated that they wanted to see more of UNDP at the field level so that they could provide direct feedback to the funder about the strengths and weaknesses of projects.

The government’s current commitment to the Paris Declaration principles, which UNDP Guyana strongly supports, illustrated another evolving dimension of UNDP partnership approach. Partnership issues with the donor community as a whole were identified by key government partners as linked to the need for much greater synchronization of donor support with government planning and funding cycles, government ownership of priorities and programmes, and progress towards more direct budgetary support and/or more pooled funding arrangements for specific sectors or ministries. They stated, in their opinion, UNDP was well-positioned to play a key role in brokering and/or modeling new partnership arrangements in these areas. The ADR found the structures and mechanisms for donor coordination and consultation were not always formalized, however, so it was difficult to obtain a precise description of how these worked (see the following section).

Donor coordination: The ADR observed UNDP had strong strategic partnerships with the international development community in Guyana. The mechanisms UNDP was involved in for

donor coordination included: 1. informal coordination/facilitation among donors themselves (both inside and outside the UN family) in terms of how to deal with emerging challenges, reduce duplication and create synergies among their respective programmes of support through semi-regular or ad hoc meetings; 2. coordination of donor dialogue with government to coherently present opinions of the donor community and to discuss strategies and options, which was both structured and unstructured; and 3. ongoing consultations with government and sometimes other international partners, through regular working groups and ad hoc meetings, to focus on how to strengthen the government's own aid coordination capabilities. In addition, the ADR found numerous examples of co-financing and leveraging arrangements between UNDP and a large number of international partners in Guyana. The latter covered all thematic areas and ranged from collaboration with the EU to fund the Region 10 development plan under SCP, to co-financing of SCP, EPTSI, elections support and the capacity building of the CDC with CIDA, DFID and IDB respectively. As noted elsewhere in the report, the amount of resources mobilized by UNDP was highly dependent on forging of strong strategic partnerships with a range of donors.

Another dimension of strategic partnerships was the extent to which UNDP sought to dovetail with other international partners and donors. For example, in the democratic governance area, coordination of electoral assistance was done in such a way that it built on the comparative strengths and priorities of the key bilateral partners with the process of support brokered by UNDP as a neutral party. UNDP did not seek to duplicate what other key agencies were doing, but played a coordination role that capitalized on each agency's strengths. Efforts to support peacebuilding were divided between UNDP, with its focus on 'softer' reforms and the community-based dimension, and bilateral agencies such as DFID, which took a more assertive and controversial approach to security sector reform. In the area of disaster relief and mitigation, the current

initiative to build CDC capacity evidently builds on expertise and interest of other agencies such as IDB and the EU, with UNDP playing the role of catalyst and overseer. Likewise, in the environment sector UNDP has focused on mobilizing GEF resources, which is complimentary to broader support offered by other lead agencies such as IDB and the World Bank in natural resource management to strengthen institutional and regulatory frameworks in a targeted way.

The majority of UNDP partners both in and outside the government indicated to the ADR team that the strategic partnership role of UNDP in Guyana in the past was closely connected to the credibility and leadership of the RR at key junctures. During periods since the early 2000s, when there was no RR in the position or the RR was unable to respond adequately to the heavy demands of the role, the ADR team learned that partnerships between UNDP and its lead stakeholders in government and among international partners were strained or less productive due to lack of continuous dialogue.

Working with non-state partners: The ADR learned UNDP took a principled and balanced approach to working with non-governmental groups, based on the analysis that much of grassroots development work is dependent on the involvement of an autonomous, motivated civil society. A number of UNDP projects over the past several years under both poverty reduction and democratic governance involved a strong civil society component, even when the lead implementing partner was a government agency, as well as consistent outreach to the private sector. The SCP in particular, because it was a DEX project, directly engaged a large cluster of new and nascent civil society and community organizations in underdeveloped regions, as well as more established and longer-standing faith-based organizations from the major religious groups. Overall, UNDP did not appear to be as effective as it could have been in promoting community ownership of environment issues when it came to liaising with civil society groups in the environment sector.

Regarding partnerships with the private sector, UNDP worked hard to integrate them into consultations and key initiatives over the past several years. Under the PRSP-I, the private sector was recognized as a key 'driver' for economic development in Guyana, so UNDP-funded projects sought to engage the private sector at different levels. For example, the EMPRETEC project was linked with the Guyana Manufacturers' Association and there was a more recent project to encourage private sector investment in small-scale community-based development in support of the MDG. There was also a strong short-term linkage with Amazon Caribbean Limited to undertake the palm plantations project in Region 1. However, some private sector representatives interviewed for the ADR requested more proactive and consistent UNDP engagement, as they believed that UNDP-supported initiatives would benefit more from supporting the public sector to become actively involved in development efforts particularly in support of the National Competitiveness Strategy.

Assisting government to use external partnerships and South-South cooperation: In terms of South-South partnerships and cooperation, several examples were documented earlier in the report, including the extensive use of UNV from developing countries. The CREDP regional project with CARICOM has incorporated some cooperative mechanisms for knowledge exchange among Caribbean countries, and UNDP Guyana contributed financially to the Rio Group meeting of heads of state held in Guyana in 2008, which facilitated some South-South knowledge sharing. UNDP also helped facilitate a one-time exchange between Amerindian communities in Regions 1 and 9 related to natural resource management and income generating activities, which some stakeholders noted could be fruitfully expanded and replicated as knowledge exchange exercises. The current GSI regional environmental initiative also has the potential for ongoing South-South cooperation between Guyana and other countries in the Amazon Cooperation Treaty Organization. Some GoG stakeholders noted there was potential for UNDP Guyana

to play a role in brokering expertise, knowledge exchange and linkages between Guyana and so-called 'non-traditional' donors outside the OECD-DAC like China and India in the future.

5.4 CONTRIBUTION TO UN VALUES

Assisting in the attainment of MDG: Over the past several years UNDP provided consistent support for the attainment of MDG in Guyana, such as the production of MDG reports in the early 2000s as well as in 2007. As noted in previous sections of the ADR, most of this support took the form of helping the lead government agencies establish statistical benchmarks for monitoring the MDG and training statisticians, as well as undertaking broadly-based consultations to engage society as a whole in tracking effects of development investments. This included funding some of the key personnel in the monitoring and evaluation unit in the Office of the President, which initially had overall responsibility for this task. One critique of investments made in MDG monitoring, however, was that not enough was done to ensure sound institutionalization of these systems. Also there were delays in producing the reports themselves and in ensuring data timeliness and quality, although most observers noted that both availability and accuracy of MDG data in Guyana had improved somewhat over time.

Contribution to gender equality: In general UNDP Guyana displayed a moderate degree of commitment to integration and mainstreaming of gender issues, but the ADR found this to be a major area of weakness in the country programme. The need to address the specific needs of women and develop women's leadership and economic opportunities was mentioned in the UNDP CCF for Guyana as an aspect of poverty reduction. This was obviously cross-linked to governance issues. As noted previously in the report, specific work at this time with the Women's Affairs Bureau did have some positive and sustainable effects. Women were significantly involved in the EMPRETEC project and small business/livelihood ventures (e.g. FTIs) towards economic empowerment and development. For

example, EMPRETEC trained more than 200 entrepreneurs, 55 percent of whom are women, and one of whom was among the 10 finalists in the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) business awards program for the Caribbean.

In the 2006 CPD gender equality, which evolved from the earlier focus on women, was mentioned as a cross-cutting theme but no details were provided regarding how this would be implemented. The CPAP document further stated gender would be mainstreamed throughout the programme but it did not appear that specific resources were dedicated to this. Some gender mainstreaming work was done with UNCT in 2005 according to country office documents but it is unclear if this was followed up on or not. Neither was there attention to how the effects of mainstreaming would be measured. The CPAP review conducted in 2008 noted the absence of a gender focal person in the UNDP country office, which was clearly an indication that gender equality work had been neglected up to that stage. No gender mainstreaming strategy, which showed how to incorporate both men's and women's concerns from the planning stage of each project, was produced for the programme.

The ADR team noted that some recent projects continued to include a focus on women as a key target group although it was clear that this fell short of a gender mainstreaming approach. For example, the work on renewable energy development in hinterland areas was cited as having had short-term immediate benefits on the lives of rural women in pilot communities. Amerindian women were involved as workers and harvesters in the Heart of Palm pilot project in Region 1, as well as in other environment initiatives to manage natural resources more effectively. Under another recent project in the poverty reduction thematic area, one women's group in Region 1 also received technical support to set up a small food processing enterprise. One clear example of an unintended negative aspect of inadequate project design regarding gender equality was during the first three years of an

early UNDP-supported poverty reduction effort in North Rupununi; not one woman accessed any of the micro-credit funds available. As it turned out this was because they needed their husband's permission to do so, so changes were eventually made in the criteria for accessing the micro-credit scheme. These examples all illustrate the inconsistencies and weaknesses of UNDP Guyana's gender mainstreaming approach.

Addressing the needs of the vulnerable and disadvantaged: Stakeholders at all levels cited UNDP as an important partner for the Amerindian population, with some significant contributions such as work to build local organizational capacity for Amerindian groups both at the community level and within local government structures in District 9 dating back to the late 1990s. As noted elsewhere, UNDP had strong partnerships with the Ministry of Amerindian Affairs and with district councils in areas with high Amerindian populations. Several ongoing and planned environment and energy projects targeted Amerindian communities.

In spite of the good work done to date, the ADR team identified several key gaps in terms of UNDP work with Amerindians. There was no evidence of an overall strategy by UNDP to address the needs of Amerindian communities or understand their priorities. Neither was there an overall strategy for development agencies including UNDP to use as a reference point in working with Amerindian groups and the government to support work on land titling for these communities. It was unclear how international partners coordinated their approaches and sought to share lessons or achieve synergies with these communities. The ADR team was concerned that many small-scale or pilot efforts supported by UNDP (commendable as they were) had a limited effect on enhancing the capacity of Amerindian groups to either reduce their dependence on external expertise or to directly address the poverty rates in their communities. The ADR found that at the community implementation level there was sometimes a lack of in-depth consultation at the planning stage and little direct follow-up and

monitoring by UNDP to ensure that Amerindian communities were not being exploited in any way and that bottlenecks and technical challenges were promptly addressed.

The ADR team noted that there were other vulnerable or disadvantaged groups in Guyana, as documented in UN CCAs from both 2001 and 2005, such as the rural Afro-Guyanese communities with more than 40 percent living below the poverty line and the rural Indo-Guyanese with more than 30 percent. However, these were not directly identified by UNDP in its programming documents as specific target groups. Both the FTI and Replicable Local Poverty Linkages projects appeared to target the ‘rural poor,’ but it was not explicitly stated in the project design who this group was possibly due to political sensitivities.

Both the 2001 and 2006 UNDAF documents (as well as the CCAs on which they were based) explicitly mentioned human rights as important UN values and emphasized that rights-based development approaches based on dignity, access and inclusion were core principles for the UN family. Many initiatives supported by UNDP in the past two programme cycles were aimed to one degree or another at strengthening rights-based approaches to development, whether in the form of social cohesion training for youth groups in poor communities on the East Coast of Demerara, supporting increased economic opportunities for rural farmers, or helping Amerindian communities create their own bylaws for improved natural resource management. Even though it is quite clear that it is not the role of UNDP to focus on normative issues, the rights-based development dimension of UNDP work, which is clearly stated in the corporate strategic plan, has not always been made as explicit as possible in its programming documents.

5.5 CONTRIBUTION TO UN COORDINATION

Support for the CCA/UNDAF process: Since the early 2000s, UNDP Guyana Country Office as a whole, and particularly when the RR position

was filled, played an important role in facilitating and coordinating the CCA/UNDAF planning process. The ADR learned that the functioning of UNCT had improved over the last several years and that in general UNDP country office, as a whole, contributed to greater UN system-wide coherence and programme coordination. Even when the RR was not in place, UNDP country office endeavored to support and promote UN system-wide coherence and coordination in programming, and to support other UN agency heads as acting RC. However, the role of UNDP RR as RC for UNCT (supported by a UN coordination analyst housed in the UNDP office) was viewed by UNCT members as absolutely crucial to the overall strategic positioning of the UN in Guyana.

As in other areas, the ADR team learned continued turnover and vacancies in the RC/RR position over the past several years had some negative effects on UNDAF implementation and the strategic role of UNCT, given that UNCT members looked to the RC to present a unified voice for UN agencies in Guyana. However, the recent UNDAF mid-term review in 2008 was generally positive regarding specific contribution of UNDP as an agency towards planned UN results, and the development outcomes stated in the CPD-CPAP were clearly nested within the current UNDAF.

UNDP also responded well to evolving programming issues within UNCT. For example, the ADR team learned UNICEF had proposed an environmental education project to the GoG but the assistance was declined because the size of the project was too small. In order to ensure the project went ahead, UNDP agreed to include the proposed UNICEF initiative as a subproject within its existing umbrella project on building natural resource management capacity to ensure that this strategic input was not lost.

Inter-organizational collaboration: The ADR learned of only one concrete example of a so-called ‘joint’ UN initiative that was implemented by UNICEF with combined UNDP and UNICEF

funding; it was related to human rights strengthening in 2006, under the umbrella of the SCP. To date there were no examples of projects implemented with pooled resources, although there were several examples provided of parallel or collaborative ventures between UNDP and both UNICEF and UNFPA. One specific area where UN family coordination has worked well so far was the promotion of the DevInfo statistical data base by UNICEF to capture MDG data, which appeared to be relatively well-integrated with wider support to the Bureau of Statistics undertaken in parallel by UNDP and IDB. The re-establishment of an FAO office in Guyana after a hiatus of several years also provides key opportunities for further inter-agency cooperation in the environment thematic area.

UN agencies told the ADR team that there were still considerable barriers to complete joint programme or project implementation because UN agencies still had different budgetary, planning and reporting mechanisms. There was also the continued perception that they needed to retain some control over their specific areas of expertise, so that they could properly account for their contributions to Guyana's overall development. However, it was mentioned by both UN and government partners that in the future they want to see closer UN family coordination and strategies developed for joint UN programming in areas such as youth economic development, reduction of economic disparities for Amerindians and the rural poor, prevention of HIV/AIDS among vulnerable groups such as men who have sex with men, PRSP monitoring, social policy support and improved government budgeting. They all acknowledged the need for UNCT to move towards joint implementation of UNDAF, but they said it was also up to UNDP as the lead UN agency in Guyana to begin to propose different mechanisms. UNCT members were generally hopeful that once all agency funding

cycles are harmonized by the time the next UNDAF is launched in 2012, there will have been some concrete progress on this front.

A final aspect of UN coordination that was noted by the ADR team was the role played by UNDP Guyana in facilitating and/or providing an oversight role for regional UNDP programmes implemented by CARICOM. However, it was not clear whether more concrete synergies were needed between the UNDP Guyana programme and broader UNDP-sponsored regional initiatives such as those to build support disaster response capabilities, social statistics expertise and fiscal management capacities in the Caribbean region as a whole.⁵³

UNDP as a window to other UN agencies and assistance: There were several concrete examples of UNDP brokering expertise from within the UN system, especially in the area of conflict resolution and prevention as well as the environment and natural disaster recovery and risk reduction thematic areas. Examples included deployment of an energy specialist from UNDP headquarters to assist in design for a new project to be launched in 2009, a process that was evidently deemed to be very useful by government. Another example was the placement of human rights advisors at different times in the UNDP Guyana Country Office by the Office of the UN High Commission for Human Rights. These advisors offered training, sensitization and capacity development input for both UN agencies and other key stakeholders (both governmental and non-governmental) in the country on how to increase the national focus on rights and inclusion, thereby decreasing political tensions. However, these placements were deemed to be only moderately successful, as they evidently did not receive sufficient institutional support to establish an effective space for addressing sensitive rights-based issues within the country.

⁵³ Two concrete examples of such UNDP-funded regional projects are the Caribbean Regional Technical Assistance Centre and the Support for Poverty Assessment and Reduction in the Caribbean, both based in Barbados.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

6.1 CONCLUSIONS

6.1.1 UNDP CONTRIBUTION TO DEVELOPMENT RESULTS IN GUYANA

In terms of overall development effectiveness, UNDP Guyana made progress towards its planned objectives and outcomes in all four thematic areas in the programme since 2001.⁵⁴ This contributed to achievement of Guyana's overall development priorities and aims. The UNDP country programme was characterized by very positive synergies among all the thematic areas, which enhanced its effectiveness and was a sensible approach for a country programme of this size. The main cross-cutting effectiveness challenges consisted of finding the appropriate mix of policy-oriented and community-based interventions, ensuring that useful linkages were forged between the two levels on an ongoing basis, and choosing the right combination of initiatives so that outcomes could be demonstrated clearly.

UNDP made some measurable progress towards the objectives and outcomes identified for poverty reduction. During the earlier programme period, the ADR concluded that UNDP had contributed to national capacity strengthening for poverty eradication in line with the main goals of PRSP-I, but these effects were difficult to measure given that the area of work was so broadly defined. Under CPD-CPAP, UNDP Guyana continued its support for strengthening institutional systems in support of both MDG and PRSP monitoring. Under both programme cycles, there was continued support for local poverty initiatives which had some limited, short-term effects, but there were few if any observable changes as a result of

these efforts on upstream policy issues. However, UNDP offered highly commendable and quite consistent support for Amerindian peoples, youth and the rural poor as key target groups.

The ADR concluded that one of the main challenges for its current involvement in poverty reduction in Guyana is that UNDP is viewed by most stakeholders as a source of funds for small-scale, community based work by a range of government, non-state and international partners. This view unfortunately runs counter to the current corporate strategic direction of UNDP, which is to focus mainly at the broader, strategic level. Therefore, the country programme in Guyana must continue to reorient its approach to poverty reduction work more in line with this new strategic direction and also ensure that its partners and other national stakeholders (including civil society and the private sector) are more clearly informed about this shift and why it is taking place. The demand for funding of small-scale, downstream micro-interventions by UNDP at the community level in income generation and employment will likely continue in Guyana given endemic needs. Nonetheless, it is essential to look critically at whether UNDP Guyana can realistically contribute much at the grassroots level in the long-term due to its limited resources and the pressing need to address the underlying policy and structural issues.

Results were also achieved in the democratic governance thematic area. During the first programme cycle, UNDP offered consistent, albeit somewhat limited, support towards building an 'inclusive democracy' in Guyana. Most of this work continued into the subsequent

⁵⁴ See Annex 3 which provides an overview of progress towards planned objectives and outcomes for the UNDP Guyana country programme for the period 2001-2008.

CPD-CPAP period. The ADR concluded that UNDP made a sound contribution to the peaceful conduct of the 2006 elections and was successful in promoting new paradigms of social inclusion in the country, although many other extraneous and internal factors influenced the situation as well and it is very difficult to judge whether any of this work produced deep or long-lasting effects. However, very little was done so far in public administration reform in order to enhance the institutional or policy frameworks related to accountability and transparency of the public service, which was another planned outcome under the CPD-CPAP. New initiatives are being planned to strengthen aid coordination and poverty monitoring during the remainder of the programme cycle may address these gaps.

Both national and international stakeholders, who participated in the ADR, expressed concerns that ongoing challenges in public sector policies, organization and management still impede the country's future social and economic development, including crucial new initiatives like the PRSP-II and the LCDS. UNDP Guyana's constructive interventions at the individual and community level have led to greater understanding and interpersonal dialogue within the broader governance context in Guyana and should definitely continue. However, these grassroots, 'bottom-up' interventions need to be reinforced in some way by parallel efforts at a broader level so that Guyana can assume its full potential as an emerging middle-income country. It is obviously not the role of UNDP to initiate work on these issues, given that the space has to be created by government; but because of UNDP Guyana's generally sound reputation as an honest broker and trustworthy development partner and its access to global technical resources on peace-building, public sector strengthening and democratic reform, there is no reason it could not play a more constructive role on this front if invited to do so by government. As well, at a more functional level there are important gaps and needs that remain in the area of public sector strengthening, including finding strategic ways to ameliorate the current 'brain drain' of

essential human resources from the country, which UNDP may be able to help the government and its partners address.

The environment and energy thematic area also made some contributions towards country-led objectives and outcomes, and the scope of work was gradually expanded over the past two programme cycles. During the CCF period, UNDP contributed to human resource development as well as to broader institutional capacity development in the environment sector by helping sensitize and train key individuals and agencies around the need to focus more attention on natural resource management issues. It also helped Guyana meet its international reporting obligations on climate change and biodiversity. UNDP Guyana contributed to the government's emerging priorities and needs in renewable energy, and it supported several capacity development initiatives related to enhancing community-based involvement and engagement in environmental work. Under the CPD-CPAP, the scope of work on environment and energy continued to increase and it became more focused on natural resource management systems and access to alternative energy sources in under-served rural areas. Commendable progress was also made towards strengthening the linkages between management and protection of natural resources by both central and local government in partnership with local communities, and on economic as well as social empowerment of Amerindian communities in the hinterlands.

Due to these accomplishments, the ADR concluded that environment and energy work had emerged successfully over the past eight years as a core area of work and UNDP Guyana has the strong potential to play a highly strategic role in these sectors in the future. This is based on the assumption that UNDP can define an appropriate niche that is commensurate with its corporate mandate to focus on upstream work as well as with its available human and monetary resources. UNDP is in an excellent position to offer policy-level support around emerging national environmental priorities, including

implementation of the new LCDS and access to and effective use of any new global funds related to combating climate change such as UN-REDD. The ADR identified numerous options for future UNDP Guyana support for the LCDS, such as strengthening structures for regulatory enforcement, decision-making, policy formulation, planning, implementation, quality assurance and accountability from local to national levels and vice versa. However, rather than get involved in too many areas, UNDP Guyana would need to focus its approach very carefully in order to build effectively on the work done to date—for example, evolving from the development of environmental regulations to increasing institutional capacity for their consistent enforcement. UNDP may also be in a position, if invited to do so, to help government to ensure greater community participation in planning, so that the benefits of sustainable, low-carbon development accrue to those most affected by forest conservation and carbon off-setting strategies.

Results were also achieved for natural disaster recovery and risk reduction in Guyana by working with the government in the early 2000s to begin to develop a country-owned strategy in response to emerging needs. Following the devastating floods of 2005, UNDP took a more prominent role not only in coordinating the immediate response to the humanitarian crisis but in strengthening institutional capacities for more sustained disaster prevention and risk management. However, early joint initiatives between UNDP Guyana and government probably required more persistence in order to quickly help the country make the shift to disaster prevention.

The ADR concluded that UNDP contributed to creating an enabling environment for better long-term enforcement of existing standards that govern coastal development and land use planning, as well as community involvement in disaster planning and response. UNDP Guyana also contributed to the growing realization among key government and non-governmental

stakeholders that there is a need to move from a focus on relief and recovery, to one based on proactive prevention and management. This is closely cross-linked to democratic governance issues as it depends on the enhanced coordination, communication, planning and policy implementation capacity of responsible national bodies. There are also strong interconnections with environmental issues such as solid waste management in urban areas, drainage and water management, effective enforcement of building codes and land use planning. UNDP is currently well-positioned to play a stronger leadership role in this area, again if requested by government. However, disaster risk reduction is a complex area due to its technical, cross-disciplinary nature and to the challenges involved in identifying the most effective entry points. Many practical challenges remain for UNDP Guyana in terms of resource mobilization, creation of effective international/regional linkages and brokering of appropriate technical support (either from within the UN system or elsewhere).

Efficiency was judged to be mixed for the UNDP Guyana programme. There were many recent examples of good managerial efficiencies, which included strong synergies among thematic areas, leveraging of resources, acceptable financial disbursement rates and administrative expense ratios according to UNDP corporate benchmarks. However, one main challenge to programme efficiency was that many projects had to be extended due to implementation delays and that some of the small-scale investments made were possibly too short-term or limited in scope to assure lasting change.

In general the ADR team concluded that efficiency challenges in the programme, especially in earlier phases, were cross-linked to several broader programme management issues including weak oversight/monitoring on the part of UNDP Guyana and its partners to identify and rectify blockages in a timely fashion. Other efficiency challenges encountered were in ensuring that projects stayed on schedule, extracting lessons learned from so-called pilot

or demonstration projects, and in launching new phases of continuing projects. The country programme has already begun to initiate some improvements in overall management efficiency, such as more rigorous attention to AWP approval and to outcome review. Challenges to developmental efficiency are starting to be addressed through more frequent consultation with the MoF to discuss and resolve project implementation delays and address the capacity needs of implementing partners in a rapid and constructive fashion while not undermining continued support for increased government leadership and ownership.

Sustainability of the results and benefits from UNDP-supported work in Guyana was mixed for the period under review. Positive examples of sustainability arising from UNDP work in Guyana were mainly in terms of individual capacity building, but there were fewer examples found of sustained, deeper change at the policy and institutional levels.

There were ongoing challenges with several small-scale or ‘pilot’ economic development initiatives in terms of both their ongoing financial or organizational viability and their ability to produce lasting development benefits for participants. Lessons learned from pilot initiatives were not always extracted so that long-term adjustments could be made to support ongoing sustainability. There was little advance planning, direct field monitoring or follow-up conducted by UNDP Guyana to examine sustainability challenges. The ADR concluded that there was a need to increase the focus on sustainability at the project design stage, including mapping out how projects fit within the broader policy and/or institutional context so that the enabling conditions for long-term sustainability were put in place from the start.

In programme management of the UNDP country programme, strong efforts were made in the past two years to enhance resource mobilization, RBM, performance review and planning. Country office senior management

has already acknowledged the need to continue to improve in these areas, given that the programme context is becoming increasingly demanding.

The ADR concluded that the country programme was in the process of overcoming a number of ongoing management, leadership and resource mobilization challenges that existed since the early to mid-2000s. In earlier phases of the period under review, there were weaknesses in results formulation and outcome level evaluation and reporting, as well as delays in project planning, approval and implementation, leading to numerous extensions. There were also challenges with ongoing follow-up, monitoring and quality assurance by the country office with project partners and beneficiaries to ensure that problems were identified and corrective action taken in a timely fashion. These issues are now being diagnosed and addressed by an increasingly proactive and systematic management approach in the country office, but they will continue to require sustained effort in the future.

6.1.2 STRATEGIC POSITIONING OF UNDP

UNDP has largely maintained its strategic relevance in Guyana since the early 2000s, due to its alignment with country priorities within its four thematic areas and its consistent scanning of the country context in order to adapt to evolving needs. Overall, UNDP comparative advantage corresponds not just to the amount of funding it provided, which was relatively modest in comparison to major international donors, but also the degree to which its strategic inputs in capacity development, small-scale demonstration projects and peace-building, as well as its flexibility and adaptability, were and are highly valued by partners at all levels.

In the future UNDP strategic relevance is likely to mainly rely on the quality and precision of its upstream policy work as well as technical or capacity development inputs within and across all four thematic areas. This may include some very

carefully and strategically selected downstream initiatives but the country programme office should resist the natural tendency to get drawn into grassroots work that meets immediate needs but ultimately has little potential for long-term lasting effects. In order to maintain its relevance in the future, it will be very important for UNDP Guyana to quickly identify its precise niche from a wide range of options within rapidly emerging frameworks such as the LCDS and PRSP-II. Continuing and emerging niche areas could potentially include addressing the needs of the most vulnerable populations and promoting South-South knowledge sharing, but of course the exact nature of support would also depend on the specific requests received from government. UNDP Guyana also has the possibility to maintain its strategic focus on responding to requests from government for support around key institutional reforms, which will strengthen the country's future successful development as an emerging middle-income country, as well as continuing to engage constructively with government about governance issues.

UNDP demonstrated its responsiveness in Guyana and it reacted quickly and effectively to emerging needs, for example, the 2008 FTI, support for the 2006 elections and the 2005 floods response. UNDP Guyana responded well to the increasing focus on environment and energy issues in the country by mobilizing more resources and technical support.

Overall, the ADR found that UNDP was able to maintain an adequate balance between short-term responsiveness and longer-term development objectives. However, it was noted that the high demands placed on the country office during 2005 and 2006 due to the floods and elections did create some challenges in terms of maintaining the country programme focus on longer-term work. These events took up so much time and energy over a two-year period that it was hard for programming staff to focus adequate attention on regular programming and to ensure good strategic direction-setting in the longer term. For example, the pipeline of

planned projects was virtually empty by 2007 and had to be rebuilt over the last two years. External resource mobilization was also quite low during this time period. Given the small size of the country office, the ADR team concluded that an intensive focus on emergency responsiveness (while extremely important and an acknowledged part of UNDP mandate) could compromise overall programme effectiveness and sustainability, as well as undermine continuity of policy dialogue and longer-term capacity needs assessments.

UNDP Guyana forged strategic partnerships at many different levels. There has been continuous positive evolution and constructive dialogue with all key national and international partners. Challenges include the need to deepen partnerships with civil society and the private sector, and with non-OECD donors.

In maintaining a strong strategic partnership approach, UNDP has had to continuously maintain a very sensitive balance between its lead or priority partnership with the GoG and its relationships with a range of other development actors including NGOs, the private sector, opposition parties and local government officials. The primary role of UNDP is to work with government as its lead implementing partner, but of course its corporate mandate also demands that it foster an inclusive approach to development by paying close attention to the views and needs of all sections of society, especially those facing challenges due to poverty or discrimination. Strong inter-agency coordination in Guyana will need to effectively coalesce around support for the LCDS, for example, where coordination with agencies such as the World Bank will be highly desirable. Other possibilities include the continuation of constructive leveraging of external partnerships to obtain additional technical inputs required by the country from across the UN system and within the UN secretariat. There also is the potential for future strategic alliances to obtain additional funding in the environment sector with FAO and UN-REDD. The ADR noted,

however, that there could possibly be more opportunities in the future to collaborate with non OECD-DAC countries, such as China, Russia, India, Brazil, Cuba and Venezuela.

UNDP Guyana has consistently reached out to involve civil society and the private sector, when possible, with more pronounced and sustained partnerships in the poverty reduction and democratic governance thematic areas and to some extent in environment and energy. A number of initiatives have provided the collective basis for further constructive opening for non-state participation and development on a non-partisan basis, which is highly commendable and consistent with broader UN values. However, some civil society members expressed confusion about the exact role of UNDP in working with them and whether there were ways of receiving more direct support from UNDP. There still remain considerable challenges in developing an autonomous and independent civil society in Guyana and it is fully consistent with UNDP corporate mandate of working with government as the lead partner to continue to find strategic ways to engage with non-state actors, such as increasing partnerships with NGOs in the environment and energy thematic area, with trade unions and with the Guyanese diaspora as a key source of technical expertise and/or financial support for national development initiatives.

UNDP Guyana made a strong and consistent contribution to UN values and coordination. Support for the MDG led to improved government commitment and stronger systems for tracking the country's progress on global development indicators. UNDP Guyana maintained consistent engagement with vulnerable groups but there were some gaps. It also played a positive leadership role in UNDAF planning but there has been weak implementation of joint programmes so far.

UNDP Guyana maintained consistent support for Amerindians as the single ethnic group most affected by poverty in the country, especially via its poverty reduction and environment/energy work in Regions 1 and 9. The country programme also focused to a lesser extent on poor, rural inhabitants, especially in Regions 5, 6 and 10, and on women and youth via several poverty reduction and democratic governance initiatives. The ADR team concluded that initiatives with the vulnerable and poor could be further strengthened if there were clear action plans or strategies for the country programme outlining both the proposed coverage of this work and its scope and rationale. The country programme's weaknesses in gender mainstreaming also demonstrated the need to ensure that gender equality analysis is integrated into the design of every UNDP-funded project in the future.

The ADR team concluded there may be more scope for UNDP to proactively address the needs of the rural poor in the context of the LCDS. Several emerging issues, including the paving of the Georgetown-Lethem road, will present critical environmental, social, cultural and other challenges for rural populations, including Amerindian communities. This would be an opportunity to strengthen cross-thematic integration between democratic governance, poverty reduction and environment and energy as well as critical dialogue with government and other stakeholders.

In terms of UN coordination, it appeared that more practical steps need to be taken by UNDP as the lead UNCT agency in Guyana to help support greater project-level collaboration between the resident UN agencies. This could include piloting joint project planning and implementation, further experimentation with co-funding arrangements, and promotion of inter-agency staff exchanges. Furthermore, greater UN agency coordination around environment programming in particular may be needed given that FAO has now recently reopened a full-time office in Guyana.

6.2 RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Policy/upstream orientation

UNDP Guyana should continue to reorient its programming towards higher-level policy change and strategic upstream work in support of the new PRSP-II and LCDS.

UNDP Guyana should continue to strengthen its recent shift towards a policy-oriented or upstream approach as stipulated in the UNDP corporate strategic plan to match the emerging lower-middle income status of Guyana and in close alignment with the strategic directions set in the new PRSP-II and LCDS. Eventually, given the shrinking resource base for this type of work, UNDP should seriously consider the feasibility of gradually and consciously moving the strong focus towards a more strategic upstream approach from small-scale, downstream community-based work over the next five years. During this transition, UNDP should also take into account the unique circumstances of the Guyana development context and the need to respond to key national priorities, and also ensure a clear interconnectedness between downstream and upstream work.

2. Inclusion and consultation

Consistent with the overall UNDP human development approach, UNDP Guyana should continue to strengthen its strategic approach to working with vulnerable groups and communities.

The strategic partnerships with targeted vulnerable groups such as Amerindians and the rural poor should be based on clearer criteria, more in-depth planning, consultations and needs assessments, and systematic analysis of the types of upstream, not just downstream, interventions needed with different subgroups. These processes should be carried out jointly with the lead government implementing agencies.

3. Capacity development

UNDP Guyana should develop a detailed strategy for capacity development that is focused on deep institutional change rather than on individual training or one-off knowledge transfer.

UNDP Guyana in close consultation with government should develop a longer-term strategy or specialized plan for capacity development that makes an explicit shift to development of strong, sustainable institutional systems commensurate with Guyana's emerging middle-income status. This strategy should take into account chronic human resource shortages in government and attempt to go beyond superficial, one-off approaches that simply enhance individual awareness or skills. Other potential examples that would require further discussion with government to reach agreement on include support for more public sector human resource development, the development of institutional incentives to reduce the brain-drain of skilled personnel, and mobilization of expertise from the diaspora to contribute more systematically to Guyana's economic and political development—all of which were raised during the ADR research by various partners.

The continued focus on national ownership is a very positive aspect of the UNDP programme, including emphasis on the NEX/NIM modality. However, UNDP should do more to develop managerial capacities and systems of partner agencies via explicitly building institutional capacity development processes into ongoing implementation processes.

4. Sustainability

UNDP Guyana should improve sustainability by working with implementing partners and beneficiaries to create realistic exit strategies for projects, extract and apply lessons, and replicate project effects.

UNDP should ensure that initial strategies are built into all project designs up-front so that explicit sustainability aims are set and progress towards sustainability can be monitored on a regular basis. Strategies could include explicit cost-sharing arrangements with lead partners, precise descriptions of how work initiated under UNDP-supported projects will be institutionalized in the long-term, and identification of specific benchmarks against which to assess progress towards sustainability and linked to results-based frameworks shown in AWP. Such approaches would enable both UNDP and its implementing partners to understand whether results are likely to be sustained over time, as well as what interventions are needed to ensure this does occur as planned.

For so-called ‘pilot’ projects, UNDP should place greater effort on researching and learning lessons from similar initiatives undertaken by UNDP and others elsewhere before planning and initiation. While pilot projects are actually being implemented, greater efforts should be made to learn from and share lessons to improve the effectiveness and chances for long-term replication of these efforts.

5. **Strategic partnerships**

UNDP Guyana should improve its partnership approach with non-state actors, as well as help strengthen the level of dialogue between these groups and government.

UNDP should continue to work closely with government to find ways of strengthening the meaningful and consistent engagement of non-state actors—that is, the private sector and civil society—in development programming. This should include assistance for strengthening the partnerships forged by the government with the private sector and civil society groups to implement specific capacity development projects in natural resource management and economic

empowerment, as these partnerships have been shown in many countries to be the most effective means to increase local ownership and sustainability. In order to guide its own work and establish more meaningful strategic and programmatic relationships with non-state actors, UNDP Guyana may also consider establishing a programme advisory committee for itself that regularly meets with representation from a wide range of non-state actors. The purpose would be to provide UNDP Guyana with an opportunity to have more sustained strategic dialogue with these groups and ensure that they clearly understand the role of UNDP and its mandate.

6. **Facilitation and coordination**

UNDP Guyana should continue to facilitate strong dialogue and relationships between lead development partners including the government and the UN system when requested and appropriate.

UNDP should continue to play a role in leading and/or facilitating dialogue between government and international partners when requested and/or as appropriate, as well as in proactively coordinating donor support within specific sectors when key gaps or opportunities appear. The exact nature of this coordination role may of course vary between programme areas depending on the context and the needs within each sector as well as the role of international partners.

7. **South-South cooperation**

UNDP Guyana should develop a strategy and action plan for fostering South-South cooperation in-country, regionally and internationally on a range of key development issues.

South-South cooperation requires a more explicit plan and strategy in the context of the country programme as well as the regional development context, that is, in relation to CARICOM and larger

movements for economic and social integration across the Caribbean such as the CSME. UNDP should continue to be as proactive and strategic in brokering more South-South exchanges and information-sharing on behalf of Guyana and in response to emerging country needs, in areas such as respect for diversity, peace-building, climate change and environmental protection, alternate energy, small enterprise development, information technology, investment and manufacturing, public sector reform, human resource development, disaster management, and mobilization of investment/development resources from 'non-traditional' development and investment partners such as emerging economies in Asia and the Middle East. This would include fostering strategic exchanges both regionally and within Guyana itself.

8. Gender equality

UNDP Guyana should develop a strategy and action plan for mainstreaming of gender equality issues.

Given that there has been no gender mainstreaming strategy in place over the past several years and no explicit commitment of resources for working on gender mainstreaming issues in the country programme, UNDP should develop such a strategy and ensure that gender issues are fully integrated within each of the thematic areas and outcomes in the next CPD-CPAP. This should, at a minimum, involve allocation of specialized resources towards gender mainstreaming work, as well as development of measurable aims and indicators to gauge progress towards gender mainstreaming.

9. Support for the RR role

UNDP headquarters should improve its corporate support for the RR role in Guyana.

Due to the key role of the RR in establishing and maintaining UNDP strategic positioning in Guyana, there should be increased analytical and strategic support from UNDP headquarters for the RR position in Guyana in order to decrease turnover and ensure leadership continuity.

10. Programme management and oversight

UNDP Guyana should continue to improve its mechanisms and systems to manage for development results.

UNDP Guyana has made substantial progress in improving its management systems in the past two years, but the momentum should be maintained to ensure that these initial measures are built on and expanded. This should include such areas as: continued support to enhancing results management and formulation of realistic and measurable results statements, design of more realistic project timeframes to prevent implementation delays, improved corporate record-keeping for the country programme, continued updating of the new resource mobilization strategy and close attention to options and opportunities for funding, increase in staffing levels commensurate with the programme's evolving needs, and enhanced focus on outcome monitoring and evaluation. There is also a need to continue to inform partners of RBM system requirements for effective project implementation, and to integrate partner capacity development and knowledge-sharing as much as possible into routine project implementation.

ADR TERMS OF REFERENCE

1. INTRODUCTION

The Evaluation Office of the United Nations Development Program (UNDP) conducts a country-level programme evaluations called Assessments of Development Results (ADRs) to capture and demonstrate evaluative evidence of UNDP contributions to development results at the country level. ADRs are carried out within the overall provisions contained in the UNDP Evaluation Policy.⁵⁵ The overall goals of an ADR are to:

- Provide substantive support to the UNDP Administrator's accountability function in reporting to the Executive Board;
- Support greater UNDP accountability to national stakeholders and partners in the programme country;
- Serve as a means of quality assurance for UNDP interventions at the country level; and
- Contribute to learning at corporate, regional and country levels.

In particular, the Evaluation Office plans to conduct an ADR in Guyana during 2009. The ADR will contribute to a new country programme which will be prepared by the Guyana Country Office and national stakeholders.

2. BACKGROUND FOR THE ADR

Guyana is a natural resource wealthy country, with a population of about 763,000 inhabitants.⁵⁶ Despite wealth in resources and enormous

economic potential, Guyana is a lower-middle income economy⁵⁷ with an estimated gross national income per capita of \$1,111 in 2007. It ranked 97 out of 177 countries in the 2007/8 UNDP Human Development Index. Migration out of the country has been on average two percent of its entire population per year. The majority of university graduates have migrated to work for the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), the Caribbean Community (CARICOM) and Common Market countries. Partly due to the perceived political and social instability in the country, investment to private sector development has been limited. Official development assistance (ODA) has also been declining. An enabling investment climate and economic development will require a stable political environment, efficient bureaucracy, and law and order.

The strategy of the Government of Guyana (GoG) to attain the Millennium Development Goals (MDG) has been articulated in its Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (PRSRP), produced in 2001. Lessons from the National Development Strategy (NDS), developed in 1993 and subsequently revised in 1998, and the constraints identified at the Business Summit in promoting private sector development in 1999 informed the design of the PRSP. The strategy has the following as its main seven pillars: (i) broad-based job-generating economic growth; (ii) environmental protection; (iii) stronger institutions and better governance; (iv) investment in human capital, with emphasis on basic education and primary health; (v) investment in physical capital,

⁵⁵ <http://www.undp.org/evaluation/documents/Evaluation-Policy.pdf>

⁵⁶ 2007 estimates, World Bank Country Brief

⁵⁷ <http://web.worldbank.org/WBSITE/EXTERNAL/DATASTATISTICS/0,,contentMDK:20421402~pagePK:64133150~piPK:64133175~theSitePK:239419,00.html>

with emphasis on better and broader provision of safe water and sanitation services, farm-to-market roads, drainage and irrigation systems, and housing; (vi) improved safety nets; and (vii) special intervention programs to address regional pockets of poverty.

With an aim to support national developmental challenges and priorities as outlined in the national strategy, UNDP Country Programme 2001-2005 was developed, primarily focusing on three practice areas: governance, poverty and environment and energy. UNDP supported, in particular, coordinating donor inputs to strengthen the Elections Commission, constitutional reforms, political dialogue and building social cohesion and peace, as well as the preparation of national reports under the human rights conventions.

The national elections in 2006 presented an opportunity for a new, less divisive political era that is conducive to sustainable economic growth. In support of the government effort to attain the MDG and realize a more peaceful and secure place for all humanity and contribute to the PRSP, the UN Country Team (UNCT) organized, in its UN Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) 2006-2010, Guyana's key challenges into three themes: expansion of human capabilities, enrichment and widening of choices/opportunities, and the fulfilment of freedoms and human rights through empowerment.

The current UNDP Country Programme 2006-2010 identified the following as inhibiting factors to the achievement of the MDG: (i) constraints on people's choices and interventions; (ii) prevailing political culture; and (iii) vulnerability to economic, environmental and social hazards. HIV/AIDS prevalence, floods, low activity rates and unemployment, and fluctuating trade agreements with the European Union on sugar also add further challenges to the achievement of the MDG. Building on the lessons gained from the previous Country Programme, the programme was developed and focused on the same practice areas, but with fewer outcome areas, with an intention to: catalyze development

through strengthening national capacity to develop evidence-based policies; improve monitoring and evaluation, hence improve strategic institutions of governance; enhance people's involvement in determining development directions; and enhance national capacities to respond to disasters and to stimulate emergency recovery initiatives. The Country Programme Document (CPD) indicates a number of cross-cutting themes, including human rights, conflict prevention, disaster management, gender and HIV/AIDS. A mid-term review on the current Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP) was conducted in October 2008 with government counterparts and the participation of national stakeholders.

A new five year PRSP (2008-2012) was endorsed by cabinet members in 2008 and is due to be reviewed and approved by parliament during the second quarter of 2009. The completion of the 2006-2010 Country Programme in Guyana presents an opportunity to evaluate UNDP contributions and short comings over the last programme cycle and before. The findings will be used as inputs to the 2011-2015 CPD within the context of the UNDAF and provide an opportunity to enhance relevance and strategic positioning of UNDP intervention in light of the new national strategy.

3. OBJECTIVES

The assessment of the development outcomes will entail a comprehensive review of the UNDP programme portfolio of the previous and ongoing programme cycles (2001-2005 and 2006-2010). The evaluation has two main components: the analysis of UNDP contribution to development results and the strategic positioning of UNDP.

DEVELOPMENT RESULTS

The assessment of the development outcomes will entail a comprehensive review of the UNDP programme portfolio of the previous and ongoing programme cycles. This includes an assessment of development results achieved and the contribution of UNDP in terms of key interventions; progress

in achieving outcomes for the ongoing country programme; factors influencing results (UNDP positioning and capacities, partnerships, policy support); achievements, progress and contribution of UNDP in practice areas (both in policy and advocacy); and analysing the crosscutting linkages and their relationship to MDG and UNDAF. The analysis of development results will identify challenges and strategies for future interventions. The following core set of criteria will be applied in assessing the results, and the indicative evaluation questions identified will be finalized with the evaluation team:

- **Relevance of UNDP programmes:** How relevant are UNDP programmes to the priority needs of the country? Did UNDP apply the right strategy within the specific political, economic and social context of the region? To what extent are long-term development needs likely to be met across the practice areas? What were critical gaps in UNDP programming?
- **Effectiveness:** Did the UNDP programme accomplish its intended objectives and planned results? What are the strengths and weaknesses of the programme? What are the unexpected results it yielded? Should it continue in the same direction or should its main tenets be reviewed for the new cycle?
- **Efficiency:** How well did UNDP use its resources (human and financial) in achieving its contribution? What could be done to ensure a more efficient use of resources in the specific country/subregional context?
- **Sustainability:** Did the UNDP programme incorporate adequate exit strategies and capacity development measures to ensure sustainability of the results? Are the benefits of UNDP interventions sustained and owned by national stakeholders after the intervention is completed?

STRATEGIC POSITIONING

The evaluation will assess the strategic positioning of UNDP both from the perspective of organization and the development priorities in the country. This will entail (i) a systematic analysis of UNDP place and niche within the development and policy space in Guyana; (ii) the strategies used by UNDP in Guyana to strengthen the position of UNDP in the development space and create a position for the organization in the core practice areas; and (iii) from the perspective of the development results for the country, the assessment will evaluate the policy support and advocacy initiatives of the UNDP programme vis-à-vis other stakeholders. The evaluation will analyze the following core set of criteria related to the strategic positioning of UNDP, and the indicative evaluation questions identified will be finalized with the evaluation team:

- **Responsiveness:** How did UNDP anticipate and respond to significant changes in the national development context? How did UNDP respond to national long-term development needs? What were the missed opportunities in UNDP programming?
- **Contribution to UN values:** How did UNDP assist national efforts in the attainment of MDG? To what extent did the UNDP programme address and contribute to the issues of social and gender equity? To what extent did the UNDP programme address the needs of vulnerable and disadvantaged?
- **Strategic partnerships:** How has UNDP leveraged partnerships within the UN system as well as with international development partners, national civil society and private sector?
- **Contribution to UN coordination**⁵⁸: Has UNDP effectively supported the development of a more effective, efficient, and coherent UN system at the country level?

⁵⁸ This criterion assesses the role of UNDP in UN coordination, as stated in the UNDP Strategic Plan (2008-2011). *“UNDP has been requested to strengthen its role in supporting the promotion of coordination, efficiency and effectiveness of the United Nations system as a whole at the country level. In its resolutions 59/250 and 62/208, the General Assembly reiterated that the management of the resident coordinator system “continue[d] to be firmly anchored in the United Nations Development Programme.”*

How has UNDP been effectively working together with other UN partners and using expert resources elsewhere in the UN system wherever appropriate?

Further elaboration of the criteria and the subcriteria will be provided in the 'ADR Manual 2009.' The manual will be finalized in early to mid-2009 and provided by the Evaluation Office task manager when it becomes available.

Further, the evaluation will also consider the influence of administrative constraints affecting the programme and specifically UNDP contribution, including issues related to the relevance and effectiveness of the monitoring and evaluation system. If during initial analysis these are considered important, they will be included in the scope of the evaluation. Within the context of partnerships with the UN system and overall UN coordination, the specific issue of the development of Joint Programmes will be highlighted.

4. EVALUATION METHODS AND APPROACHES

DATA COLLECTION

In terms of data collection, the evaluation will use a multiple method approach that could include document reviews, group and individual interviews (at both Headquarters and the country office), project/field visits, and surveys or questionnaires, as appropriate. The set of methods would vary depending on country context and the precise nature would be determined during the scoping mission and detailed in an inception report.⁵⁹

VALIDATION

The evaluation team will use a variety of methods to ensure that the data is valid, including triangulation. Precise methods of validation will be detailed in the inception report.

STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT

An inclusive approach, involving a broad range of partners and stakeholders, will be taken. The ADR will have a process of stakeholder mapping that would identify both UNDP direct partners as well as stakeholders who do not work directly with UNDP, but play a key role in a relevant outcome or thematic area in a national context. These stakeholders will include representatives from the government, civil-society organizations, the private-sector, UN agencies, other multilateral organizations, bilateral donors, and most importantly, the beneficiaries of the programme.

5. EVALUATION PROCESS

The ADR process will also follow the ADR Guidelines, according to which the process can be divided in three phases, each including several steps.

PHASE 1: PREPARATION

- **Desk review**—Based on the preparatory work by the Evaluation Office (identification, collection and mapping of relevant documentation and other data), the evaluation team will analyze, *inter alia*, national documents and documents related to UNDP programmes and projects over the period being examined.
- **Stakeholder mapping**—The evaluation team will prepare a basic mapping of stakeholders relevant to the evaluation in the country carried out at the country level. The mapping exercise will include state and civil-society stakeholders and go beyond UNDP partners and will also indicate the relationships between different sets of stakeholders.
- **Scoping mission**—A scoping mission to the country will be undertaken to:
 - Ensure the country office and key stakeholders understand the ADR objectives, methodology and process

⁵⁹ The scoping mission and inception report on the evaluation process are described in Section 5.

- Clarify the understanding of development challenges of the country with the government and other key stakeholders in the country
- Understand the perspective of key stakeholders on the role of UNDP in addressing development challenges with a view to formulating focused evaluation questions
- Deepen the understanding of UNDP programme, projects and activities with the country office staff
- Develop a concrete plan in conducting this evaluation in consultation with the country office staff, including selection of data collection methods, selection of projects for field visits and addressing logistical issues
- Identify and collect further documentation, as required
- Address management issues related to the rest of the evaluation process including division of labour among the team members

The scoping mission will be undertaken by the team leader and the task manager (and the national consultant if available).

- **Inception Report**—A short inception report will be prepared by the team leader, following the scoping mission. The report will present the evaluation design, which encompasses the stakeholder mapping, evaluation questions and methods to be used, information sources and plan for data collection, including selection of project/field sites for visits, and design for data analysis.

PHASE 2: CONDUCTING ADR AND DRAFTING EVALUATION REPORT

- **Main ADR mission**—A mission of two to three weeks to Guyana will be undertaken by the evaluation team in line with the

inception report. The team will visit significant project/field sites as identified in the scoping mission. At the exit meeting of the mission with key stakeholders, the evaluation team will provide a debriefing of the preliminary findings to the country office and key stakeholders, take initial comments and validate the preliminary thoughts.

- **Analysis and reporting**—The information collected will be analyzed and the draft ADR report will be prepared by the evaluation team within three weeks after the departure of the team from the country. The draft report will be submitted by the team leader to the task manager, who will review the report to ensure that the report complies with the Terms of Reference, the Inception Report and the professionally acknowledge quality standards and guidelines.⁶⁰
- **Review**—Once the draft report is accepted by the task manager based on its satisfactory quality, it will be subject to a formal review process. This process entails: (i) a technical review by the Evaluation Office; (ii) a review by UNDP country office, Regional Bureau for Latin America and the Caribbean (RBLAC) and the government focusing on factual errors and omissions and errors in interpretation; and (iii) a review by two external experts. The team leader in consultation with the task manager will prepare an audit trail to show how these comments are taken in to account in the revision process. The team leader has the overall responsibility to address these comments in the finalization of the ADR report.
- **Stakeholder meeting**—A meeting with the national stakeholders will be organized in the country to present the results of the evaluation and examine ways forward. The purpose of the meeting is: to facilitate greater buy-in by national stakeholders for taking forward the lessons and recommendations from

⁶⁰ This includes United Nations Evaluation Group Norms and Standards (2005) and ADR guidelines and draft methods manual.

the report; and to strengthen the national ownership of development process and the necessary accountability of UNDP interventions at country level.

PHASE 3: FOLLOW-UP

- **Management response**—UNDP Associate Administrator will request the country office to prepare a management response to the ADR. As a unit exercising oversight, RBLAC will be responsible for monitoring and overseeing the implementation of follow-up actions in UNDP publicly available on-line database, the Evaluation Resource Centre (ERC).⁶¹
- **Communication and dissemination**—The ADR report and brief will be widely distributed in both hard and electronic versions. The evaluation report will be made available to UNDP Executive Board by the time of

approving a new CPD. It will be widely distributed to stakeholders in the country and at UNDP headquarters, to evaluation outfits of other international organizations, and to evaluation societies and research institutions in the region. The report and the management response will be published on the UNDP website⁶² and the ERC. Its availability will be announced on UNDP and external networks.

QUALITY ASSURANCE

The Evaluation Office task manager is responsible for enhancing the quality of the process and products. There will be at least two external evaluation experts identified to review the inception report, as well as the draft evaluation report. The Evaluation Office is ultimately responsible for assuring the evaluation quality.

The timeframe and responsibilities for the evaluation process are tentatively as follows:

Activity	Estimated Date (to be discussed further with the CO and RBLAC and will depend on the schedule of the evaluators)
Collection and mapping of documentation by the Research Assistant	Mid-April–May 2009
Desk review by the Evaluation Team	May–June 2009
Scoping mission to Guyana	3–9 June 2009
Evaluation Team meeting in UNDP New York	10–12 June 2009
Inception report and full ADR ToR	End June 2009
The following are tentative and will be firmed during the scoping mission in consultation with the CO and the government:	
Main ADR mission to Guyana	7–23 July 2009
Submission of first draft report	End August 2009
Comments from Evaluation Office and Advisory Panel	September 2009
Submission of second draft report	End September 2009
Factual corrections from country office, RBLAC, and the government	October 2009–April 2010
Stakeholder workshop	April 2010
Issuance of final report	May 2010

⁶¹ erc.undp.org

⁶² www.undp.org/evaluation/

6. MANAGEMENT ARRANGEMENTS

UNDP EVALUATION OFFICE

The Evaluation Office task manager will manage the evaluation process. She will support the team in designing the evaluation; ensure coordination and liaison with UNDP Guyana Country Office, RBLAC, and other concerned units at its headquarters; supervise the work of the Research Assistant; participate in the missions; provide ongoing advice and feedback for quality enhancement; manage the review process; and assist the team leader, as appropriate, in finalizing the report.

The evaluation team will be supported by the Research Assistant based in the Evaluation Office at the initial stage of the process to collect and organize necessary information, and by the Programme Assistant throughout the process on logistical and administrative matters.

The Evaluation Office will meet all costs directly related to the conduct of the ADR. These will include costs related to participation of the team leader and Team Specialists, as well as the preliminary research and the issuance of the final ADR report. Evaluation Office will also cover costs of any stakeholder workshops as part of the evaluation.

THE EVALUATION TEAM

The team will be constituted of three members:

- Team leader (international consultant), with overall responsibility for providing guidance and leadership, and in coordinating the draft and final report
- Two Team Specialist(s), international or national consultant(s), who will support the team leader and provide the expertise in the core subject areas of the evaluation, and be responsible for drafting relevant parts of the report

The work of the evaluation team will be guided by UNDP evaluation policy (2006), the Norms and Standards established by the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG). The members must adhere to the ethical guidelines for evaluators in the UN system and the Code of Conduct⁶³ established by UNEG. The evaluators will be requested to sign the Code of Conduct prior to engaging in the ADR exercise.

UNDP COUNTRY OFFICE IN GUYANA

The country office will support the evaluation team in liaising with key partners and other stakeholders, making available to the team all necessary information regarding UNDP programmes, projects and activities in the country, and taking a lead role in organizing dialogue and stakeholder meetings on the findings and recommendations. The office will also be requested to provide additional logistical support to the evaluation team as required. The country office will contribute support in kind for example, office space for the evaluation team, but the Evaluation Office will cover local transportation costs.

7. EXPECTED OUTPUTS

The expected outputs from the evaluation team are:

- The inception report (maximum 20 pages)
- The final report ‘Assessment of Development Results—Guyana’ (maximum 50 pages plus annexes), which is in line with the ADR 2009 manual and meets the quality standards outlined in the UNEG and UNDP guidelines.
- An evaluation brief (maximum two pages)
- A presentation at the stakeholder meeting
- All drafts will be provided in English. In producing written materials, the evaluation team is expected to apply guidance in the UNDP Evaluation Office publications manual.

⁶³ All documents available at www.uneval.org

8. QUALIFICATIONS OF TEAM MEMBERS

The team leader must have: demonstrated capacity in strategic thinking and policy advice and leading an evaluation of complex programmes in the field, substantive knowledge of two or more of the programmatic areas of UNDP work in Guyana or in the region, in-depth knowledge of development issues in Guyana and/or other

countries in the region, advanced degree in the social sciences or related fields, proven drafting skills and leadership skills, and familiarity with UNDP or UN operations will be a plus.

The Team Specialists should have substantive knowledge of one or two programmatic areas of UNDP work in Guyana or in the region and in-depth knowledge of development issues in Guyana and/or other countries in the region.

EVALUATION FRAMEWORK

D1. Effectiveness				
Criteria/ Subcriteria	Main questions to be answered by the ADR	What to look for	Data sources and collection methods	
			Sources	Methods
D1.1 Progress towards achievement of outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Did the project implementation (as well as any non-project activities) contribute to progress towards the stated outcome? 	<p>a. Primary research: Examples of results or effects (both expected and unexpected) achieved for selected projects (as well as for non-project activities if examples are available) under each of the thematic areas in the Guyana country programme (i.e. the main thematic areas are poverty reduction, democratic governance, environment/energy and crisis prevention and recovery—note that HIV/AIDS is subsumed under poverty reduction)</p> <p>b. Synthesis/analysis: linkages between the cluster of project-level results achieved and overall progress towards programme-level results (as outlined in the CCF/CDF/CPAP), based on the above examples—see also D1.2</p> <p>c. Synthesis/analysis: Overall performance analysis of UNDP Guyana’s programme—why results were or were not achieved for individual projects and for the programme overall (explanation of mitigating factors) plus analysis of possible future implications for the programme (NOTE: linked to S1.1)</p>	<p>CCA (2005) CCF (2001-2003, extended to 2005) CPD (2006-2010) CPAP (2006-2011) CPAP Mid-term review (2008) UNDAF Mid-term review (2008) UNDP Strategic Plan (2008-2011) GoG PRSP Progress Reports (2004, 2005, 2007?) Selected programme documents (workplans, budgets, reports, evaluations, programme meeting minutes, etc.) ROARS 2004-2008 RC annual reports (2003-2008) GoG implementation partners and beneficiaries Non-state implementation partners and beneficiaries UN agencies (UNCT members) involved in any UNDP-funded activities Bilateral and multilateral agencies involved in any UNDP-funded activities CO managers and staff</p>	<p>Document review/analysis Open-ended interviews (individual and group) Observations made during project site visits in Guyana plus: Team synthesis/analysis of information received from the above sources</p>

D1. Effectiveness (continued)				
Criteria/ Subcriteria	Main questions to be answered by the ADR	What to look for	Data sources and collection methods	
			Sources	Methods
D1.2 Alignment with and relevance to outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How do these projects relate to the stated outcomes? • How did the implementation of different projects or the mix of project and non-project intervention contribute to maximizing the results? 	<p>a. Primary research: Review how projects are grouped or clustered under each thematic areas, how well they were matched with corresponding programme outcomes, and examples of linkages between different projects and among multiple thematic areas (if applicable)</p> <p>b. Primary research: Examples of any relevant non-project activities related to UNDP networking, information-brokering, coordination, facilitation, etc., and how these contributed to programme outcomes</p> <p>c. Synthesis/analysis: Extent of coherence and synergies/convergence among projects and activities under each thematic area, evolving mix or type of projects, which projects or activities made greater or lesser contributions to overall programmatic results and why (explanation of mitigating factors), based on the above examples plus analysis of possible future implications for the programme</p>	As above	As above
D1.3 Reaching poor and disadvan- taged groups	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Did the implementation of the projects have positive impact on poor and disadvantaged groups? • How was that impact achieved? 	<p>a. Primary research: Examples of projects that had a direct or indirect effect on women, youth, Amerindian groups, or any other marginalized or disadvantaged groups in Guyana</p> <p>b. Primary research: Specific examples of any innovative methods or strategies that were used to reach or involve these groups</p> <p>c. Synthesis/analysis: Overall effects of the UNDP Guyana programme on poor and disadvantaged groups, consistency of focus on poor and disadvantaged groups, any best practices, implications for the programme in the future, etc., based on the above examples plus analysis of possible ways to focus UNDP strategy with these groups</p>	As above plus: Any available secondary data showing overall poverty rates and geographic or social distribution of poverty incidence in the country (e.g. CDB, Bureau of Statistics, UNICEF, etc.)	As above

D2. Efficiency				
Criteria/ Subcriteria	Main questions to be answered by the ADR	What to look for	Data sources and collection methods	
			Sources	Methods
D2.1 Managerial efficiency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have the UNDP programmes been implemented within deadlines, costs estimates? • Have UNDP and its partners taken prompt actions to solve implementation issues? 	<p>a. Primary research: Examples of timely and/or cost-efficient delivery of projects, and examples of leveraging or resource mobilization for specific projects that multiplied UNDP resources</p> <p>b. Primary research: Examples of projects that encountered problems in AWP preparation or approval from UNDP or government, other delays, cost over-runs, disbursement challenges, etc., and examples of what was done about this (see also D3.2)</p> <p>c. Primary research: Observations, examples and information related to specific management issues such as CO organization, human resource issues, HQ guidance and support, M&E systems, supervision, knowledge management, communications (both external and internal), etc.</p> <p>d. Synthesis/analysis: General patterns or trends that can be derived from the above examples in relation to managerial efficiency, including timeliness, responsiveness, adaptability and appropriateness of UNDP managerial systems, etc. and implications for the programme, based on the above examples plus analysis of possible future implications for the programme</p>	<p>UNDP ATLAS database including CO Scorecards, combined with EO compilation of programme financial data on thematic expenditures, resource flows and delivery rates, etc.</p> <p>Country office programme documents: CCF/CPD, CPAP, AWP for projects, reports and/or evaluations</p> <p>CO Resource Mobilization Strategy 2008-2010 (2008)</p> <p>CO RBM Plan of Action (2009)</p> <p>CPAP Mid-term review (2008)</p> <p>RBLAC managers and staff (optional)</p> <p>CO managers and programme staff</p> <p>GoG implementation partners and beneficiaries</p> <p>Non-state implementation partners and beneficiaries</p>	<p>Document review/analysis</p> <p>Open-ended interviews (individual and group)</p> <p>Observations made during project site visits in Guyana</p> <p>plus: Team synthesis/analysis of information received from the above sources</p>

D2. Efficiency (continued)				
Criteria/ Subcriteria	Main questions to be answered by the ADR	What to look for	Data sources and collection methods	
			Sources	Methods
D2.2 Programmatic efficiency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Were the UNDP resources focused on the set of activities that were expected to produce significant results? • Were resources combined among any UNDP interventions that contributed to reducing costs while supporting results? 	<p>a. Primary research: Information on rate and scope of programme expenditures based on ATLAS data available since 2004 (e.g. how resources are spread across programme interventions, mechanisms to improve budget planning and forecasting, financial delivery rates for the programme, expenditure patterns per thematic area, comparison of programme/admin expenditure ratios, etc.)</p> <p>b. Primary research: Examples of any cost savings or efficiencies in resource expenditures under the programme, such as (1) combining technical or training inputs across projects, (2) using inputs prudently to support multiple activities or projects, etc.</p> <p>c. Synthesis/analysis: General patterns or trends that can be derived from the above in relation to programmatic efficiency, including scope of results obtained at the programme level in comparison to amount and type of resources invested over time, based on the above examples plus analysis of possible future implications for the programme</p>	As above	As above
D2.3 Avoiding over-burden- ing of other partners	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Did the programme implementation place an undue burden on some partners? • If so, what were the consequences? 	<p>a. Primary research: Examples of how current projects report on results to UNDP, frequency and depth of reporting, type of reporting requirements, and whether these requirements met partner needs</p> <p>b. Primary research: Examples of projects where implementation partners had to provide additional or unplanned reports, or where the duplication in reporting processes occurred (within or outside the UN system)</p> <p>c. Synthesis/analysis: Any issues or concerns related to requirements or demands placed on implementation partners, corrective actions taken or needed, implications for the programme, etc., based on the above examples plus analysis of possible future implications for the programme</p>	As above	As above

D3. Sustainability				
Criteria/ Subcriteria	Main questions to be answered by the ADR	What to look for	Data sources and collection methods	
			Sources	Methods
D3.1 Design for Sustainability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Were interventions designed to have sustainable results given the identifiable risks and did they include an exit strategy? 	<p>a. Primary research: Specific examples of projects or interventions (e.g. use of UNV personnel) with/without a clear sustainability or exit strategy built into their design</p> <p>b. Synthesis/analysis: Potential for continuation or replication of any results or benefits that have accrued from UNDP projects or activities and from the programme overall, based on the above examples plus analysis of possible future implications for the programme</p>	<p>Selected programme background documents: CCA, CCF/CPD, CPAP, project proposals, reports, evaluations, etc.</p> <p>Any exit/sustainability plans within programme/project documentation (see above)</p> <p>ROARS 2004-2008</p> <p>CO managers and staff</p> <p>GoG implementation partners and beneficiaries</p> <p>Non-state implementation partners and beneficiaries</p> <p>Co-funding agencies (UN and non-UN) for UNDP-supported projects</p>	<p>Document review/analysis</p> <p>Open-ended interviews (individual and group)</p> <p>Observations made during project site visits in Guyana</p> <p>plus: Team synthesis/analysis of information received from the above sources</p>
D3.2 Issues at implementa- tion and corrective measures	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What issues emerged during implementation as a threat to sustainability? • What were the corrective measures that were adopted? 	<p>a. Primary research: Specific examples of where external/internal issues or threats emerged that affected sustainability of project results, and what was done to address these challenges</p> <p>b. Synthesis/analysis: Trends in UNDP response to threats or risks to sustainability in the country programme, based on the above examples plus analysis of possible future implications for the programme</p>	As above	As above
D3.3 Upscaling of pilot initia- tives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If there was testing of pilot initiatives, was a plan for scaling up initiatives prepared and how did upscaling proceed? 	<p>a. Primary research: Specific examples of where so-called 'pilot projects' did or did not lead to scaling up or continuation, and implications or effects of this</p> <p>b. Synthesis/analysis: Trends related to 'piloting' of any initiatives and their actual success or continuation, based on the above examples plus analysis of possible future implications for the programme</p>	As above	As above

S1. Strategic Relevance

Criteria/ Subcriteria	Main questions to be answered by the ADR	What to look for	Data sources and collection methods	
			Sources	Methods
S1.1 Relevance against the national development challenges and priorities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Did UNDP address the development challenges and priorities and support the national strategies and priorities, while operating within its mandate as outlined in the current Strategic Plan 2008-2011? 	<p>a. Primary research: same as D1.1—examples of project-level results and non-project results/ effects</p> <p>b. Synthesis/analysis: same as D1.1—logical linkages between the cluster of project-level results achieved and overall progress towards programme-level results (as embodied in the CPAP, for example) see also D1.2</p> <p>c. Synthesis/analysis: same as D1.1—why results were or were not achieved (mitigating factors), based on the above examples</p> <p>d. Synthesis/analysis: Contribution of UNDP (and by extension, UNDAF) programme results (as embodied in CPAP) and progress towards goals of GoG as embodied in the PRSP (2002) or any updates of that document, based on the above examples plus analysis of possible future implications</p>	<p>CCA (2005)</p> <p>CCF (2001-2003, extended to 2005)</p> <p>CPD (2006-2010)</p> <p>CPAP (2006-2011)</p> <p>CPAP Mid-term review (2008)</p> <p>UNDAF (2006-2011)</p> <p>UNDAF Mid-term review (2008)</p> <p>GoG NDS (2001-2010)</p> <p>GoG PRSP (2002)</p> <p>GoG PRSP progress reports (2005, 2007)</p> <p>Selected programme documents: project proposals, reports, evaluations, etc.</p> <p>GoG implementation partners and beneficiaries</p> <p>Non-state implementation partners and beneficiaries</p> <p>UN agencies (UNCT members) involved in any UNDP-funded activities</p> <p>Bilateral and multilateral agencies involved in any UNDP-funded activities</p> <p>CO managers and staff</p>	<p>Document review/analysis</p> <p>Open-ended interviews (individual and group)</p> <p>Observations made during project site visits in Guyana</p> <p>plus: Team synthesis/ analysis of information received from the above sources</p>

S1. Strategic Relevance (continued)				
Criteria/ Subcriteria	Main questions to be answered by the ADR	What to look for	Data sources and collection methods	
			Sources	Methods
S1.2 Leveraging the implemen- tation of national strategies and policies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Did the UNDP programme facilitate the implementation of the national development strategies and policies and play a complementary role to the Government? 	<p>a. Primary research: Specific examples of projects or initiatives under the Guyana country programme that supported GoG policy objectives under the four thematic areas</p> <p>b. Synthesis/analysis: UNDP level of contribution to implementation of national policy objectives under different thematic areas, based on the above examples plus analysis of possible future implications for the programme</p>	As above	As above
S1.3 Corporate and comparative strengths	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Was the UNDP strategy designed to maximize the use of its corporate and comparative strengths as outlined in the current Strategic Plan (2008-2011)? 	<p>a. Primary research: Specific examples of UNDP-supported projects or initiatives where the main comparative strengths (e.g. government ownership, capacity development e.g. via UNV, knowledge brokering, policy/advocacy dimensions of development, South-South cooperation and exchange, donor/government coordination) have been displayed</p> <p>b. Primary research: Specific examples of what agencies may be doing in any of these areas</p> <p>c. Synthesis/analysis: Comparison between what UNDP and other partners are doing in these areas to identify UNDP best niche, evolving trends or patterns in the nature of UNDP support over time, in terms of the types of implementation or partnership modalities used, the degree to which ownership and capacity was transferred to the GoG, whether UNDP was able to utilize or broker different types of capacity development or knowledge sharing from among UN or South-based resources based on the above examples, plus analysis of possible future implications for the programme</p>	As above, plus BDP/BCPR in UNDP HQ, consultants, etc.	As above

S2. Responsiveness

Criteria/ Subcriteria	Main questions to be answered by the ADR	What to look for	Data sources and collection methods	
			Sources	Methods
S2.1 Responsive- ness to evolution and changes in develop- ment needs and priorities	<p>• Was UNDP responsive to the evolution over time of development challenges and the priorities in national strategies, or significant shifts due to external conditions, commensurate with its mandate and comparative strengths as outlined in the Multi Year Funding Framework (2004-2007) and the Strategic Plan (2008-2011)?</p>	<p>a. Primary research: Specific examples of where UNDP changed the nature of its support (project or non-project) to respond to changing GoG priorities or needs, in a way that reflected its comparative strengths and mandate, and/or where it was able to provide additional resources (e.g. UNV technical inputs) in a timely fashion</p> <p>c. Synthesis/analysis: Overall degree of responsiveness of the UNDP programme in Guyana— i.e. ability to meet changing situations and priorities, ability to respond to rapid requests for assistance in a timely fashion, ability to adapt the programme directions to changing priorities and needs, etc.—but in a way that ‘made sense’ given its comparative strengths and mandate plus analysis of possible future implications for the programme</p>	<p>CCF (2001-2003, extended to 2005) CPD (2006-2010) CPAP (2006-2011) CPAP Mid-term review (2008) UNDAF (2006-2011) UNDAF Mid-term review (2008) GoG NDS (2001-2010) GoG PRSP (2002) GoG PRSP progress reports (2004, 2005, 2007?) ROARS (2004-2008) RC annual reports (2003-2008) Country office documents: project proposals, AWP, reports, evaluations, etc. GoG implementation partners and beneficiaries Non-state implementation partners and beneficiaries UN agencies (UNCT members) involved in any UNDP-funded activities Bilateral and multilateral agencies involved in any UNDP-funded activities CO managers and staff</p>	<p>Document review/analysis Open-ended interviews (individual and group) Observations made during project site visits in Guyana plus: Team synthesis/ analysis of information received from the above sources</p>

S2. Responsiveness (continued)

Criteria/ Subcriteria	Main questions to be answered by the ADR	What to look for	Data sources and collection methods	
			Sources	Methods
S2.2 Mechanisms to respond to crisis and emergencies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Did UNDP have an adequate mechanism to respond to significant changes in the country situation, in particular in crisis and emergencies? 	<p>a. Primary research: Specific examples of where UNDP Guyana was able to respond rapidly to crises such as the 2005 floods, ethnic violence, etc.</p> <p>b. Primary research: Specific examples of role played and mechanisms used (including the availability of human and financial resources) in rapid response by UNDP, timeliness of the response, how UNDP adapted its role and response to meet the requirements of the post-crisis situation, etc. plus analysis of possible future implications for the programme</p> <p>b. Synthesis/analysis: Trends or patterns in UNDP response to past crisis events in Guyana— quality of response systems, adaptations or improvements needed plus analysis of possible future implications for the programme</p>	As above, plus BDP/BCPR in UNDP HQ, consultants, etc.	As above
S2.3 Balance between short-term responsiveness and long-term development objectives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How are the short-term requests for assistance by the Government balanced against long-term development needs? 	<p>a. Primary research: Specific examples of short-term, gap-filling or fast-track activities undertaken by UNDP in all four thematic areas, and their effects or implications on the programme overall (related to degree of broader outcome alignment— see also D1.2)</p> <p>b. Primary research: Examples of criteria or processes used to determine what level/type of support to provide under immediate or short-term requests from GoG</p> <p>b. Synthesis/analysis: Trends or patterns in response to short-term requests, and implications for the UNDP programme of focusing on short-term vs long-term initiatives, based on the above examples plus analysis of possible future implications for the programme</p>	As above, plus Rapid scan of recent newspaper articles and media reports in Guyana concerning government priorities and emerging issues	As above

S3. Contribution to UN Values

Criteria/ Subcriteria	Main questions to be answered by the ADR	What to look for	Data sources and collection methods	
			Sources	Methods
S3.1 Assisting in the attain- ment of MDG	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is the UN system, and UNDP in particular, effectively supporting the Government towards the achievement of the MDG in general? 	<p>a. Primary research: Specific examples of projects or initiatives where UNDP has advocated for or championed MDG implementation and/or follow-up/monitoring in Guyana (either alone or in partnership with other UN agencies under UNDAF)</p> <p>b. Synthesis/analysis: Implications of this support for GoG progress towards the MDG—UN and UNDP contribution towards any MDG-related targets, and degree of transfer of ownership to the GoG for MDG implementation and tracking, based on the above examples plus analysis of possible future implications for the programme</p>	<p>CCF (2001-2003, extended to 2005) CPD (2006-2010) CPAP (2006-2011) CPAP Mid-term review (2008) UNDAF (2006-2011) UNDAF Mid-term review (2008) GoG NDS (2001-2010) GoG PRSP (2002) GoG PRSP progress reports (2004, 2005, 2007?) GoG MDG progress reports (need dates) Country office documents: project proposals, reports, evaluations, etc. GoG implementation partners and beneficiaries Non-state implementation partners and beneficiaries UN agencies (UNCT members) Bilateral and multilateral agencies CO managers and staff</p>	<p>Document review/analysis Open-ended interviews (individual and group) Observations made during project site visits in Guyana plus: Team synthesis/analysis of information received from the above sources</p>

S3. Contribution to UN Values (continued)

Criteria/ Subcriteria	Main questions to be answered by the ADR	What to look for	Data sources and collection methods	
			Sources	Methods
S3.2 Contribution to gender equality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is the UNDP programme designed to appropriately incorporate in each practice area contributions to the attainment of gender equality? 	<p>a. Primary research: Specific examples of where gender strategies or action plans have been developed for the UNDP country programme, and/or where gender has been mainstreamed into UNDP-supported projects or initiatives, and any effects of this, and/or where CO resources or capacities have been deployed in support of gender equality work (both internally and externally to UNDP)</p> <p>b. Primary research: Specific examples of gender-related coordination, management, training and capacity building carried out by the UNDP CO either internally or externally, and effects of this to date</p> <p>c. Synthesis/analysis: Status of gender mainstreaming and commitment to gender issues within the UNDP Guyana Country Office—strengths, weaknesses, areas of achievement and areas for improvement, based on the above examples plus analysis of possible future implications for the programme</p>	As above, plus UNDP background documentation on gender mainstreaming Gender specialists/advisors in various partner agencies	As above
S3.3 Addressing the needs of the vulnerable and disadvan- taged	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Did the UNDP programme target the needs of vulnerable or disadvantaged segments of society so as to advance towards social equity? 	<p>a. Primary research: Examples of any strategies or plans prepared by the CO related to how to target the needs of these groups, as the basis for UNDP engagement</p> <p>b. Synthesis/analysis: Analysis of UNDP commitment and intentionality regarding addressing the needs of the vulnerable and disadvantaged in Guyana, based on above examples as well as specific examples of work carried out as found under S1.3</p>	As above	As above

S4. Strategic Partnerships

Criteria/ Subcriteria	Main questions to be answered by the ADR	What to look for	Data sources and collection methods	
			Sources	Methods
S4.1 Effective use of partnerships for development results	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has UNDP leveraged its interventions through a series of partnerships to enhance their effectiveness? • Have there been cases of missed opportunities for using partnerships more effectively? 	<p>a. Primary research: Specific examples of where partnerships have been created by UNDP to create benefits for projects and elsewhere—this may also include examples of where UNDP Guyana helped create innovative partnership arrangements between different stakeholders including the GoG, private sector, other non-state organizations, UNV (as a linked agency to UNDP), other development agencies (UN and non-UN), etc. in order to support achievement of development results at either the project or programme level</p> <p>b. Primary research: Specific examples of where UNDP may have missed key partnership opportunities within its mandate, either with government or with other key actors such as non-state actors, UN agencies, UNV, multilateral or bilateral agencies, etc.</p> <p>c. Synthesis/analysis: Trends or patterns related to partnership arrangements by UNDP Guyana, including any major changes in types of partnerships with government and others, based on the above examples plus analysis of possible future implications for the programme</p>	<p>CCF (2001-2003, extended to 2005) CPD (2006-2010) CPAP (2006-2011) CPAP Mid-term review (2008) UNDAF (2006-2011) UNDAF Mid-term review (2008) Country office documents: project proposals, reports, evaluations, etc. GoG implementation partners and beneficiaries Non-state implementation partners and beneficiaries UN agencies (UNCT members) involved in any UNDP-funded activities Bilateral and multilateral agencies involved in any UNDP-funded activities CO managers and staff</p>	<p>Document review/analysis Open-ended interviews (individual and group) Observations made during project site visits in Guyana plus: Team synthesis/analysis of information received from the above sources</p>

S4. Strategic Partnerships (continued)

Criteria/ Subcriteria	Main questions to be answered by the ADR	What to look for	Data sources and collection methods	
			Sources	Methods
S4.2 Working with non-state partners	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has UNDP worked in partnership with non-governmental and/or private sector actors to maximize the impact of its projects? 	<p>a. Primary research: Specific examples of where UNDP Guyana has worked with NGO or other voluntary sector partners, and results or effects achieved</p> <p>b. Primary research: Specific examples of where UNDP Guyana has worked with private sector partners, and results or effects achieved</p> <p>c. Primary research: Examples of how UNDP has developed strategies or plans to work with non-state actors, and how these plans (if any) have provided guidance for development programming decisions</p> <p>d. Synthesis/analysis: Trends or patterns in partnership arrangements with between UNDP and non-state actors, how and why UNDP has made these strategic choices, and effects of these partnerships on project-level and programme-level results achievement, based on the above examples plus analysis of possible future implications for the programme</p>	As above with specific emphasis on non-state implementation partners and beneficiaries	As above

S4. Strategic Partnerships (continued)

Criteria/ Subcriteria	Main questions to be answered by the ADR	What to look for	Data sources and collection methods	
			Sources	Methods
S4.3 Assisting government to use external partnerships and South-South cooperation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has UNDP been effective in assisting the government to partner with external development partners? • Has UNDP sought to maximize the opportunity of using South-South cooperation as a mechanism to enhance development effectiveness? 	<p>a. Primary research: Specific examples of projects or activities which have incorporated the use of South-South cooperation and/or leveraging strategies, e.g. training, exchanges, technology transfers, information-sharing, strategic advice, etc.</p> <p>b. Primary research: Specific examples of where UNDP Guyana has assisted the GoG to engage with or obtain benefits from other development partners (both UN and non-UN), via direct referrals or other coordination or consultation mechanisms, as requested by the government</p> <p>c. Synthesis/analysis: Trends or patterns in promoting South-South cooperation mechanisms, and in engaging with GoG and others to ensure maximum advantages are obtained from partnerships, based on the above examples plus analysis of possible future implications for the programme</p>	As above, plus BDP/BCPR in UNDP HQ, consultants, etc.	As above

S5. Contribution to UN Coordination

Criteria/ Subcriteria	Main questions to be answered by the ADR	What to look for	Data sources and collection methods	
			Sources	Methods
S5.1 Undertaking the CCA/ UNDAF process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Was the CCA/ UNDAF process logical and coherent and undertaken in full partnership with UNCT and non-resident agencies and national stakeholders? 	<p>a. Primary research: Examples of UNDP facilitation role in UNDAF and UNCT, including process for assistance with conducting the CCA, for developing and reviewing the UNDAF strategy, etc.</p> <p>b. Synthesis/analysis: Overview of UNDP Guyana facilitation role in UNDAF/UNCT, based on above examples plus analysis of possible future implications for the programme</p>	<p>CCA (2005) UNDAF (2006-2011) UNDAF Mid-term review (2008) Available documentation (PCG minutes, other presentations, notes or reports related to UNDP role in UNDAF) UNCT agencies/ PCG representatives</p>	
S5.2 Other Inter-organizational collaboration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has UNDP facilitated greater collaboration among UN and other international agencies working in the country? 	<p>a. Primary research: Examples of UNDP Guyana participation, contributions and facilitation role in theme groups, donor/country harmonization efforts and planning or implementation of any joint UN programmes</p> <p>b. Synthesis/analysis: Overview of UNDP Guyana role in inter-agency collaboration, in relation to changing trends in donor assistance and engagement in Guyana, based on the above examples plus analysis of possible future implications for the programme</p>	<p>As above, plus GoG implementation partners and beneficiaries Bilateral and multilateral development agencies</p>	As above
S5.3 UNDP as a window to other UN agencies and assistance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has UNDP been able to facilitate a national process of appropriation of the UN system's knowledge, expertise and other resources? 	<p>a. Primary research: Examples of where UNDP Guyana has been able to act as a broker between the GoG and various national stakeholders and other sources of knowledge, funding or expertise in the UN system (i.e. resident and non-resident UN agencies), both inside and outside Guyana (note: this may include GEF, BDP, BCPR, etc.)</p> <p>b. Synthesis/analysis: Overview of UNDP Guyana contributions to greater scope and range of assistance options for the GoG and other national and local development stakeholders, based on the above examples plus analysis of possible future implications for the programme</p>	<p>As above, plus GoG implementation partners and beneficiaries</p>	As above

Annex 3

RESULTS OVERVIEW FOR THE UNDP GUYANA COUNTRY PROGRAMME 2001-2008

Country Cooperation Framework 2001-2005	
Planned Objectives/Results	Summary of progress towards results
<p>Poverty reduction: To provide catalytic and synergistic support for achieving the goals of the national capacity-strengthening for poverty eradication. (see planned outputs, Table 10)</p>	<p>Limited capacity building and strengthening of government IT systems related to PRSP monitoring and tracking of progress towards the MDG.</p> <p>Limited strengthening and upgrading of the statistical system within the Bureau of Statistics (in relation to the above) through funding of statistician posts in key ministries.</p> <p>Pilot initiatives to enhance productive employment, income generation and leadership skills for Amerindians and women via EMPRETEC, Heart of Palm and Women's Leadership Institute as well as via environment projects in North Rupununi and Region 1 (see below). Mixed or incomplete results achieved in terms of lasting change in economic conditions for affected populations.</p>
<p>Democratic governance: To continue to provide support for efforts to build an inclusive democracy. (see planned outputs, Table 10)</p>	<p>No specific support provided to strengthen constitutional commissions, Race Relations Commission, foster inter-party dialogue and consultation at the political level in line with national constitutional reform aims. Some support for consensus-building and dialogue activities at the community/individual level via SCP. Limited or no strengthening of local, municipal, regional and national institutions and organs of government.</p> <p>Some positive support offered to strengthen electoral process and enhance technical capacities of GECOM.</p> <p>Limited efforts to support gender equality and women's leadership via the Women's Leadership Institute (see above).</p> <p>Non-project: Co-chaired joint governance committee with Office of the President.</p>
<p>Environment: Human resource development for environmental stability. (see planned outputs, Table 10)</p>	<p>Partial or limited training conducted to sensitize government officials in key agencies (e.g. EPA, Forestry Commission, Ministry of Agriculture) on how to address environmental issues.</p> <p>Some work done to increase level of community involvement and engagement in rural, hinterland communities on environment issues, especially for Amerindians.</p> <p>Capacity development conducted of the EPA as lead government stakeholder, leading to increased planning and project management skills among key staff members.</p> <p>Improved access to GEF resources/funding.</p>

Country Programme Document/Country Programme Action Plan 2006–2010

Planned Objectives/Results	Summary of progress towards results
<p>Poverty reduction PRS/PRSP prepared to ensure participatory process with civil society in policy formulation and programming, and taking into consideration clear linkages with human development and the MDG (CPAP outcome 1.2). (see planned outputs, Table 10)</p>	<p>Partial improvements in PRSP-I and MDG monitoring capacities (continued from CCF period). Some improvements in design and use of indicators, as well as availability and accuracy of data to measure progress towards key national development aims. Main beneficiary was a unit which is now disbanded, so long-term institutional capacity not yet assured.</p> <p>Some short-term effects achieved in decentralized participation for monitoring and tracking of key poverty and development indicators. Moderate participation achieved for beneficiary groups in input/planning for PRSP-II. Long-term effectiveness of decentralization compromised by lack of institutionalization.</p> <p>Continued support for the Bureau of Statistics. Limited institutional effects, as support for new statistician positions did not continue when project ended.</p>
<p>Broad-based, multi-sectoral and multi-level response generated, integrating HIV/AIDS into national development plans and mainstreaming HIV/AIDS into key sectors and ministries.</p>	<p>At the request of government, no specific projects were funded to integrate HIV/AIDS into national development plans or mainstream HIV/AIDS into key sectors/ministries.</p> <p>Non-project: UNDP participated actively in UNCT working groups and committees, provided limited administrative support for use of Programme Acceleration Funds from UNAIDS.</p>
<p>Local poverty initiative(s) linked to policy change undertaken (CPAP Outcome 1.3). (see planned outputs, Table 10)</p>	<p>Limited/partial capacity built to develop decentralized poverty reduction strategies. Unclear what the extent is of lasting institutionalization of these efforts (as noted under CCF above).</p> <p>Limited capacity built of private sector towards achievement of the MDG, through support for the National Working Group (NWG) project. Pilot or trial support offered to small-scale poverty reduction efforts, unclear what lasting effects will be as yet.</p>
<p>Community and regional development strategies will take into consideration national, sectoral and external trade policies.</p>	<p>No projects completed.</p>
<p>Democratic governance Institutional/legal/policy frameworks established to promote and enforce accountability, transparency and integrity in the public service (CPAP Outcome 2.7). (see planned outputs, Table 10)</p>	<p>Partial support for electoral process to meet international standards: negotiation of 2005 joint government-donor MOU, logistical and technical support for flow-through of elections funding by international partners, technical support for GECOM (IT and MMU). Unclear what support offered to institutional reform of the electoral system (in terms of transparency, accountability, etc.).</p> <p>Limited support offered to government's promotion human rights via OHCHR advisor 2005-2007. Level of institutionalization or lasting change not clear.</p> <p>No support offered to improve access to or quality of justice as originally planned in CPD-CPAP.</p>

Country Programme Document/Country Programme Action Plan 2006–2010 (continued)

Planned Objectives/Results	Summary of progress towards results
<p>Social cohesion and peace-building approaches factored into national development frameworks, and integrated into programmes designed and implemented at the national and local level (with due regard paid to the promotion of human rights) (CPAP Outcome 4.1). (see planned outputs, Table 10)</p>	<p>Some capacity built in institutions, civil society organizations and political parties in social cohesion and peace-building activities via SCP (continued from CCF period). Some individual, small-scale effects noted in terms of peaceful dialogue, response to conflict in selected communities through SCP as well as 2008 Fast Track initiative. Limited support offered to political dialogue and inclusiveness at an institutional level.</p>
<p>Environment and energy Access to energy services, electricity or cleaner fuels in rural areas increased (CPAP Outcome 3.3). (see planned outputs, Table 10)</p>	<p>Limited/partial capacity built in hinterland communities for generation and use of renewable energy, on a pilot basis only. Some capacity built in the use of renewable energy technologies for social and economic development e.g. some improved access to electrification to support health/education, foster productive enterprises in hinterland areas in Regions 1 and 9.</p>
<p>Value of biodiversity factored into national planning, and government and local communities empowered to better manage biodiversity and the ecosystem (CPAP Outcome 3.5). (see planned outputs, Table 10)</p>	<p>Limited/partial capacity built in hinterland Amerindian communities to management community natural resources through development of local bylaws. Unclear what efforts made to scale up or replicate these models more widely. Some capacity built at national level with key environment agencies for planning and management of natural resources, as well as land use management (continued from CCF). UNDP contributed to formulation of environmental regulations and international reporting. Limited institutionalization and enforcement of regulations to date.</p>
<p>Natural disaster recovery and risk reduction Sector-specific national and local expertise developed, covering disaster-preparedness planning and mitigation of risks and vulnerabilities with specific attention to gender (CPAP Outcome 4.5). (see planned outputs, Table 10)</p>	<p>Limited capacity built so far with CDC and other government agencies to reduce and manage environmental risk from natural disasters as follow-up to 2005 floods. New project launched as of 2008/2009, therefore too early to assess results.</p>

Annex 4

LIST OF INDIVIDUALS CONSULTED

GOVERNMENT OF GUYANA

Tarachand Balgobin, Head of Project Cycle Management Division, Ministry of Finance

Lennox Benjamin, Chief Statistician, Bureau of Statistics

Pradeepa Bholanath, Head of Planning and Development, Guyana Forestry Commission

Carl Brandon, Director, Youth Division, Ministry of Culture, Youth and Sport

Gitanjali Chandarpal, Climate Change Office, Office of the President

Rudolph Collins, Policy Advisor, Multilateral Unit, Ministry of Foreign Affairs

Collin Croal, Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Legal Affairs

Elsie Croal, former Consultant, former Head of Monitoring Unit, Office of the President

Rovin Deodat, former Director of Education Information and Training, Environmental Protection Agency

David Fredericks, Research Scientist, National Agricultural Research Institute

Coby Frimpong, former Head of Monitoring Unit, Office of the President

Elizabeth Harper, Director General, Ministry of Foreign Affairs

Ivelaw Henry, Senior Statistician, Ministry of Human Service and Social Security

Sudha Joshi, Research Officer, Ministry of Home Affairs

Sasha Layne, Statistician, Ministry of Housing and Water

Donna Levi, Head of Bilateral, Ministry of Finance

Roger Luncheon, Head of the Presidential Secretariat, Office of the President

Andrea Mahammad, Senior Land Use Planner, Guyana Lands and Surveys Commission

Mortimer Mingo, Regional Chairman, Region 10

Audrey Nedd-Johnson, Economic and Financial Analyst, Bilateral Department, Ministry of Finance

Shyam Nokta, Chair, National Climate Change Committee, Office of the President

Bal Persaud, former Executive Director, Environmental Protection Agency

Annie Pitamber, Project Coordinator, Second National Communication on Climate Change, Ministry of Agriculture

Vanessa Profitt, Statistician & Deputy Census Officer, Bureau of Statistics

Zainool Rahaman, Project Coordinator, Hydrometereological Department, Ministry of Agriculture

Indarjeet Ramdass, Executive Director, Environmental Protection Agency

Sharifa Razack, Director of Information and Training, Environmental Protection Agency

Leon Roberts, Information Officer, Region 10

Carolyn Rodrigues-Burkett, Honourable Minister, Ministry of Foreign Affairs

Deolall Rooplall, Project Coordinator, Ministry of Local Government and Regional Development

Patricia Roopnarine, Statistician, Ministry of Education

Dominique Saheed, Senior Environmental Officer, Natural Resources Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency

Dharam SeehoChan, Statistician, Bureau of Statistics

Seewchan, Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Local Government and Regional Development

Bhaleka Seulall, Chief Hydrometereological Officer, Ministry of Agriculture

Odessa Shako, National Ozone Officer, Hydrometereological Department, Ministry of Agriculture

Mahenda Sharma, Chief Executive Officer, Guyana Energy Agency

Yvonne Stephenson, Information Resources Manager, Ministry of Human Services and Social Security

Gail Teixeira, Governance Advisor, Office of the President

Trevor Thomas, Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Human Services and Social Security

Sheila Veerasammy, Coordinator, Guyana Women's Leadership Institute, Ministry of Human Services and Social Security

Horace Williams, Electrical Engineer, Office of the Prime Minister

Ovid Williams, Principal Regional Development Officer, Ministry of Amerindian Affairs

NATIONAL COMMISSIONS, POLITICAL PARTIES AND PARLIMENTARIANS

Colonel Francis Abraham, Commissioner, Civil Defence Commission

G. C. Boodoo, Chief Election Officer, Guyana Elections Commission

Gavin Campbell, IT Consultant, Guyana Elections Commission

Oscar Clarke, General Secretary, Peoples' National Congress Party

Captain Kester Craig, Commissioner, Civil Defence Commission

Jainarine Deonauth, Project Manager, Media Monitoring Unit, Guyana Elections Commission

Shaun Dey, Youth Leader, Peoples Progress Party-Civic

Remington Eastman, Manager, Media Monitoring Unit, Guyana Elections Commission

Bishop Juan Edghill, Chairman, Ethnic Relations Commission

Winston Felix, former Commissioner, Guyana Police Force

Sheila Holder, Member of Parliament, Alliance for Change Party

Christine King, Chief Executive Officer, Ethnic Relations Commission

Adel Lilly, Policy Development Officer, Guyana Youth and Student Movement

Allan Moore, Central Executive Committee, Peoples' National Congress Party

Colonel Chabilal Ramsarup, Director General, Civil Defence Commission

Clarissa Riehl, Member of Parliament, Peoples' National Congress Party

Africo Selman, Member of Parliament, Peoples' National Congress Party

Steve Surujbally, Chairman, Guyana Elections Commission

Rafael Trotman, Member of Parliament, Alliance for Change Party

John Willems, Commissioner, Ethnic Relations Commission

NON-STATE ACTORS (NGOS/CIVIL SOCIETY/PRIVATE SECTOR)

Elizabeth Alleyne, Senior Technical Officer, Private Sector Commission

EMPRETEC trainees: Eric Benjamin, Owner/Managing Director, Design Perspectives; Shawn Benn, Owner/Manager, Professional Auto Bodywork Ltd.; Irene Bauhus-Holder,

Owner/Manager, Irene's Creative Handicraft; Patricia Helwig, Director, Despat's Creative Craft, Nicholas Young, Owner/Manager, Rainforest Pottery;

Denys Bourque, Chief Executive Officer, Amazon Caribbean (Guyana) Ltd

Denis Chabrol, Guyana Press Association

Ramesh Dookhoo, Vice Chairman, Private Sector Commission

Dorothy Fraser, Director, Guyana Red Cross Society

Eugene Gilbert, Director, EMPRETEC Guyana

Gerald Gouveia, Chairman, Private Sector Commission

Zaheeda Hack, Peer Educator/Volunteer, Central Islamic Organization

Hazel Halley-Burnett, Social Worker/Consultant, Guyana Professional Social Workers Association

Avril Jackson, former Technical Coordinator, Skills Training Project

Ryan Kirton, Technical Officer, Private Sector Commission

Norwell Hinds, Programme Director, Bartica Cooperative Association

Jean La Rose, Programme Administrator, Amerindian Peoples' Association

Mike McCormack, Co-President, Guyana Human Rights Association

Ivor Melville, Executive Director, Bartica Cooperative Association

Roxanne Myers, Consultant

Eric Phillips, Executive Director, African Cultural and Development Association

Xavier Richard, former Project Manager, Amazon Caribbean (Guyana) Ltd

Pryia Roy, Consultant, Guyana Red Cross

Cleonel Samuels, Coordinator, Women Across Differences

Judy Semple-Joseph, Managing Director, EMPRETEC Guyana

David Singh, Director, Conservation International Guyana

Major General (retd) Joe Singh, Chief Executive Officer, Guyana Telephone and Telegraph Company

Patrick Williams, Director, World Wildlife Fund Guyana

Patrick Zephyr, President, Guyana Small Business Association

STAKEHOLDERS AND PARTNERS MET DURING FIELD VISITS

GEORGETOWN

Representatives of various faith-based organizations via a focus group organized by the Ethnic Relations Commission (Iamei Aowmathi, Mansoor Baksh, Derek Collymore, Onesi La Fleur, Mr. Deodatt Lellack, Joyce Nauth, Raheena Rahaman, and Roopnarain Persaud,)

REGION 1

Liston Augustus, Arnold Benjamin, and Audley James, Wardens/Community Members, Almond Beach (Guyana Marine Turtle Conservation Society)

Nigel Fisher, Deputy Regional Executive Officer

Christina James, Juanita Mendonca, and Mary Richards (Blue Flame Women's Group)

Peter Saywack, Businessman, Wauna

Fermin Singh, Chair, Regional Development Council (Mabaruma)

Mary Williams, Regional Executive Officer

Leslie Wilson, Agricultural Technician, National Agricultural Research Institute

Representatives from various villages via focus groups organized by the regional government, including Wauna, Black Water/Barima, Amika River, Aruka River, Unity Square, St. Anselm's, Lower Kaituma River, Koriabo/Arukamai, Hobodeia, Hotoquai, Three Brothers, Toshao, etc. (Isabella Alberts, Edwin Ali, Jeanita Ali, Richard Anthony, Patrick Antonio, William Aternawds, Reginald Bitonico, Bonny Boyer, Emran Canwais, Dianne Caravaio, Neil Chu, Abraham Daniels, Maurice Daniels, Ronald Daniels, Gregory da Silva, Neville Debdeem, Franklyn Edwards, Marcellus Gonsalves, Maurice Harvey, Stanley Herape, Magdalen Hutson, Perlyn Mentore, Doreen Nazier, Peter Nazier, Ryan Nazier, Brian Nazin, Elise Osekmo, Yvonne Persaud, Eula Raphael, Denise Roberts, Cy Rodrigues, Ellory San, Owen Singh, Eugene Tachideen, John Wang, Lawrence Williams, Leonie Williams, and Julian Webber)

REGION 5

Conrad Charles, Chair Neighbourhood Development Committee, Central Mahaicony

Alex Foster, Executive Director, St. Francis Community Developers

Hyacinth Holder, Cane Grove Community Craft Production Centre

Representatives from Calcutta/Central Mahaicony via focus group organized by St. Francis Community Developers (Medella Bobb-Blackman, Michella Bob-Blackman, Haniyfa Calder, Nikisho Crawford, Ruben D'Agua, Paul Dasilica, Sherlock Dorchester, Hasence Downer, Shaquille Downer, Tyrone English, Daneil Fordyce, Emmanuel Klass, Kenny Klass, Loren Halley, Jemaicy Inniss, Jermainy Lambert, Lansley Lindo, Damion Moore, Tiffayne Pyle, Vuvanand Ramdiel, Akeem Smith, Almond Smith, Haniyya Webster, Cesil Wolfe, and Gloria Wolfe)

REGION 9

Sydney Allicock, Chair, North Rupununi District Development Board

Michael James, Finance Officer, North Rupununi District Development Board

Richard Persaud, Pilot Site Coordinator, GSI Project

Claire Singh, Vice Chair, Regional Development Council (Letham)

Representatives from villages via focus groups organized by the regional government, including Annai, Katika, Yupukaii, St. Ignatius, Rupertel, Swiama, Aranaputa Valley, etc. (Griselda Adams, Emily Allicock, Suzette Andries, Alberta Brasche, Terrence Brasche, Brenda Browne, Noel Caiten, Abiora Dookram, Alphonse Foule, Mark George, Hatley Jacobs, Margaret Jacobs, Yvonne Jacobus, Lionel Joffen, Wilson Lorentino, Desmond Michael, Desmond Moses, Justina Moses, Richard Moses, Rudolph Roberts, Nerina Sandy, Evan Saipio, Elio Singh, Pamela Wash, Derek Williams, Michael Williams, and Norbert Williams)

REGIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

Clement Humes, Senior Project Officer, Resource Mobilization and Technical Assistance Unit, Caribbean Community Secretariat

Sandy Griffith, Project Officer, Caribbean Community Secretariat

Percival Marie, Executive Director, Resource Mobilization and Technical Assistance Unit, Caribbean Community Secretariat

Alexis Murray, Project Officer, Resource Mobilization and Technical Assistance Unit, Caribbean Community Secretariat

Leighton Waterman, Senior Project Officer Energy, Caribbean Community Secretariat

Joseph Williams, Programme Manager Energy, Caribbean Community Secretariat

BILATERAL AND MULTILATERAL ORGANIZATIONS BASED IN GUYANA

Simone Banister, Regional Climate Change Advisor, Department for International Development (UK)

Rigo Belpaire, Economic Officer, European Union, Delegation of the European Commission

Johanna Cooke, Deputy Head, Department for International Development (UK)

Charles Court, High Commissioner of Canada to Guyana

Raymond Drouin, Counsellor (Development), Canadian International Development Agency

William Gelman, General Development Officer, United States Agency for International Development

Winston Harlequin, Programme Management Specialist, United States Agency for International Development

Anna Iles, Programme Officer, Canadian International Development Agency

Nicola Jenns, Head, Department for International Development (UK)

Brett Maitland, Head of Aid, Canadian International Development Agency

Mark Montgomery, Governance and Security Advisor, Department for International Development (UK)

Giampiero Muci, Project Officer, Economic Section, European Union, Delegation of the European Commission

Sybille Nuenninghoff, Sector Specialist, Inter-American Development Bank

Marco C. Nicola, Representative, Inter-American Development Bank

David Noble, Acting Mission Director, United States Agency for International Development

Dhanmattie Sohail-Welch, Democracy and Governance Advisor, United States Agency for International Development

Giorgio Valenti, Country Representative, The World Bank

UN SECRETARIAT

Elizabeth Solomon, Human Rights Advisor, Department of Political Affairs, UN

UNITED NATIONS COUNTRY TEAM IN GUYANA

Reuben Del Prado, Country Coordinator, UNAIDS

Lystra M. Fletcher-Paul, Country Representative, Food and Agriculture Organization

Geoffrey Ijumba, acting Country Representative, UNICEF

Kathleen Israel, Country Representative, Pan-American Health Organization/World Health Organization

Patrice Lafleur, Assistant Representative, UNFPA

Cairan O'Toole, M&E and Social Policy Consultant, UNICEF

Audrey Michele Rodrigues, Programme Officer Education, UNICEF

Luis Seoane, Family and Community Health Advisor, Pan-American Health Organization/World Health Organization

Ottilla St. Charles, Monitoring & Evaluation Officer, UNAIDS

Johannes Wedenig, Country Representative, UNICEF

Sean Wilson, National Project Coordinator, ILO/USDOL HIV/AIDS Workplace Education Programme

UNDP HEADQUARTERS, NEW YORK

Niky Fabiancic, Deputy Assistant
Administrator, Regional Bureau for Latin
America and the Caribbean

Carla Khammar, Senior Programme Advisor,
Regional Bureau for Latin America and the
Caribbean

Chetan Kumar, Senior Conflict Prevention
Advisory, Conflict Prevention and Recovery
Team, Bureau for Crisis Prevention and
Recovery

Raquel Lagunas, Institutional Development
Advisor, UINDP Gender Team, Bureau for
Development Policy

Jeffrey O'Malley, Director, HIV/AIDS Group,
Bureau for Development Policy

Gay Rosenblum-Kumar, UN Interagency
Framework Team for Preventive Action,
Bureau for Crisis Prevention and Recovery

Gregory Wordsworth, Energy Policy Advisor,
Environmental and Energy Group, Bureau
for Development Policy

UNDP GUYANA COUNTRY OFFICE

Trevor Benn, Analyst, Governance and Poverty

Marlon Bristol, Analyst, Poverty

Patrick Chesney, Project Manager, Guiana
Shield Initiative

Trevor Clark, Project Manager, EPTSI

Patrick John, former Finance Associate,
Elections Support Project

Amaly Kowlessar, Programme Assistant,
Governance and Poverty

M. Kiari Liman-Tinguiri, Resident
Representative

Nadine Livan, Programme Assistant,
Environment and Energy

Juanita Mangal, former Programme Assistant,
Disaster Response Project

Patsy Ross, Analyst, Environment and Energy

Margo Singh, UN Coordination Analyst

Didier Trebucq, Deputy Resident
Representative

Annex 5

LIST OF DOCUMENTS CONSULTED

- Caribbean Community (CARICOM) Secretariat, 'Caribbean Community Mission to Guyana: Herdmanston Accords,' Georgetown 17 January 1998.
- Caribbean Community (CARICOM) Secretariat, 'St. Lucia Statement' Georgetown 2 July 1998.
- Caribbean Renewable Energy Development Programme (CREDP), 'Draft Memorandum of Understanding Governing the Implementation of the Project: Grid Stability and Soil Test Studies for the Hope Beach Wind Park, Guyana between CARICOM and the Government of Guyana' (no date).
- Caribbean Renewable Energy Development Programme (CREDP), 'Draft Memorandum of Understanding Governing the Implementation of the Project: Hydropower Feasibility Studies on the Chung River between CARICOM and the Government of Guyana' (no date).
- Civil Defence Commission Guyana/UNDP, 'Building Guyana Together: National Disaster Risk Reduction and Management Workshop, Final Report,' December 2005.
- Department for International Development UK (DFID), 'Ready to Grow: Helping the Caribbean Emerge as a Global Partner—The UK Government's Regional Development Strategy for the Caribbean,' 2008.
- Environmental Protection Agency of Guyana, 'Guyana National Capacity Self-Assessment Report,' February 2007.
- Environmental Protection Agency of Guyana, 'Strategic Plan 2006-2010,' 2005.
- European Commission, 'Guyana Country Strategy Paper and National Indicative Programme 2008-2013,' 2008.
- European Commission, 'Project Monitoring Report: Guiana Shield Initiative,' June 2009.
- Guyana Bureau of Statistics, 'Household Income and Expenditure Survey,' 2006.
- Guyana Bureau of Statistics, 'Population and Housing Census 2002,' October 2005.
- Guyana Bureau of Statistics/UNICEF, 'Guyana: Monitoring the Situation of Women and Children— Multiple Indicator Cluster Survey 2006.'
- Guyana Elections Commission, 'Media Monitoring Unit: Consolidated Monitoring Report 1st January 2008-31st December 2008,' with appendices.
- Guyana Elections Commission, 'Media Monitoring Unit: Monitoring Report 1st January 2009-30th June 2009,' with appendices.
- Government of Guyana, 'The Amerindian Act Amended,' 2006.
- Government of Guyana, 'Budget 2002: Promoting Economic Growth, Accelerating Social Gains.'
- Government of Guyana, 'Budget 2003: Confronting the Challenges, Staying the Course for a Prosperous Guyana.'
- Government of Guyana, 'Budget 2005: Confronting Challenges, Sustaining Growth and Development.'
- Government of Guyana, 'Budget 2006: Transforming Guyana Through Modernization and Partnership.'
- Government of Guyana, 'Budget 2007: Building a Modern and Prosperous Guyana.'

- Government of Guyana, 'Budget 2008 Staying the Course, Advancing the Transformation Agenda.'
- Government of Guyana, 'Budget 2009: Reinforcing Resilience.'
- Government of Guyana, 'Energy Policy of Guyana,' 1994.
- Government of Guyana, 'Guyana Climate Change Action Plan,' 2001.
- Government of Guyana, 'Guyana Millennium Development Goals 2007.'
- Government of Guyana, 'Guyana Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper' (no date).
- Government of Guyana, 'Interim Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper,' October 2000.
- Government of Guyana, 'National Biodiversity Action Plan II 2007-2011,' 2006.
- Government of Guyana, 'National Biodiversity Action Plan,' 1999.
- Government of Guyana, 'National Development Strategy 2000-2010' (no date).
- Government of Guyana, 'National Environmental Action Plan,' 1994.
- Government of Guyana, 'Workshop Report: National Consultation on Disaster Management and Presentation on Comprehensive Disaster Management in the Caribbean,' October 2002.
- Government of Guyana/Region 10 RDC/ European Commission/UNDP, 'Region 10 Development Strategy 2008-2012,' July 2007.
- Government of Guyana / UNICEF, 'Country Programme Action Plan' (no date).
- Government of Guyana/United Nations Country Team, 'Mid-Term Review of UNDAF 2006-2010 of the United Nations,' November 2008.
- Government of Guyana/United Nations Country Team, 'United Nations Development Assistance Framework for the Republic of Guyana 2006-2010,' April 2005.
- Government of Guyana/UNDP, 'Assessment of Land Degradation Study: Report of Assessment of Land Degradation in Pilot Area' (undated).
- Government of Guyana/UNDP, 'Country Programme Action Plan 2006-2010' (no date).
- Government of Guyana/UNDP, 'Final Report Mid-Term Review, Country Programme Action Plan 2006-2010,' November 2008.
- Guyana Forestry Commission/United Nations Development Programme, 'Guyana Forestry Commission Action Plan,' 2006.
- Government of Guyana/UNDP, 'Resource Valuation in Guyana: Case Study Report,' June, 2009.
- Government of Guyana/UNDP, 'Strategic and Results Based Framework for Disaster and Loss Reduction,' July 2003.
- 'Herdmanston Accord,' 17 January 1998.
- International Monetary Fund, 'Guyana Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper Progress Report 2004,' December 2004.
- International Monetary Fund, 'Guyana Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper Progress Report 2005,' October 2006.
- Inter-American Development Bank, 'Country Strategy with Guyana 2008-2012,' February 2009.
- Inter-American Development Bank, 'Debt Sustainability in Guyana,' October 2007.
- Inter-American Development Bank/ Conservation International, 'Avoiding Deforestation while Promoting Sustainable Development: South American Regional Infrastructure Development, Forests and REDD—Implications for Guyana,' July 2009.
- Inter-American Development Bank/DFID/ CIDA/UNDP, 'Guyana Democratic Governance and Institutional Assessment: Volume I—Executive Summary and Action Plan,' August 2008.

- Inter-American Development Bank/DFID/CIDA/UNDP, 'Guyana Democratic Governance and Institutional Assessment: Volume II—Full Report,' August 2008.
- 'Memorandum of Understanding for the Support of the Next General Elections in Guyana between Government of Guyana, Guyana Elections Commission and Donors,' 20 July 2005.
- Ministry of Foreign Affairs Guyana, 'Final Report to UNDP Guyana: Capacity Building Project for Management of Natural Resources and the Environment,' March 2009.
- Office of the President, Government of Guyana, 'A Low Carbon Development Strategy: Transforming Guyana's Economy While Combating Climate Change (draft for consultation),' May 2009.
- Office of the Prime Minister, 'Evaluation Report of the Hinterland Electrification by Renewable Energy Pilot Project,' February 2009.
- Office of the Prime Minister, 'Post Project Evaluation Report to UNDP Guyana: Capacity Building and Demonstration Projects for the Electrification of Hinterland Unserved Areas Utilizing Renewable Energy,' October 2006.
- Orozco, Manuel, 'Distant but Close: Guyanese Transnational Communities and Their Remittances from the United States (draft report),' USAID, January 2004.
- Orozco, Manuel, 'Remittances Back Home to Guyana: Issues and Options,' Inter-American Dialogue, 7 November 2002.
- People's Progressive Party of Guyana, 'Towards Greater Inclusive Governance: Building Trust to Achieve Genuine Political Cooperation', presented by the PPP/C Government, State House: Georgetown, February 2003.
- Simmons, Terrance and Roxanne Myers, 'From Violent to Peaceful Elections: A Preliminary Look at Peace-Building Initiatives in Guyana' (no date).
- Spatial Systems Caribbean Ltd, 'Watershed Analysis and Assessment Report,' May 2009.
- UNAIDS, 'Guidance Notes for Programme Acceleration Funds (PAF) 2004-2005.'
- UNDG, 'Guyana: Resident Coordinator's Annual Report 2003.'
- UNDG, '2002 Report of the UN Resident Coordination System in Guyana' (letter to the Secretary General of the UN), February 2003.
- UNDG, 'Guyana: Resident Coordinator's Annual Report 2004.'
- UNDG, 'Guyana: Resident Coordinator's Annual Report 2006.'
- UNDG, 'Guyana Workplan 2006: Country Coordination Profile.'
- UNECLAC, 'Statistical Yearbook for Latin America and the Caribbean,' 2008.
- UNICEF, 'Draft Report of the Programme Performance Assessment of UNICEF in Guyana,' September 2008.
- UNICEF, 'Report of the Mid Term Review: Government of Guyana-UNICEF Programme of Cooperation 2006-2010' (no date).
- United Nations, 'Common Country Assessment and United Nations Development Assistance Framework: Guidelines for UN Country Teams on Preparing CCA and UNDAF,' February 2007.
- United Nations, 'The Millennium Development Goals Report 2005.'
- United Nations, 'The Millennium Development Goals Report 2006.'
- United Nations, 'The Millennium Development Goals Report 2008.'

- United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD), 'World Investment Report 2008: Country Fact Sheet for Guyana.'
- United Nations Country Team, 'United Nations Common Country Assessment of Development Challenges in Guyana,' 2000.
- United Nations Country Team, 'United Nations Common Country Assessment of Development Challenges in Guyana,' May 2005.
- United Nations Country Team, 'United Nations Development Assistance Framework for Guyana 2001-2003,' February 2001.
- United Nations Country Team, 'UN Programme Coordination Group Guyana: Draft Terms of Reference' (no date).
- UNDP, 'Human Development Report 2003.'
- UNDP, 'Human Development Report 2009.'
- UNDP, 'Second Multi-Year Funding Framework 2004-2007,' 2003.
- UNDP, 'Strategic Plan 2008-2011,' 2007.
- UNDP, 'Strategic Plan 2008-2011: Addendum I, Development and institutional results frameworks,' 2008.
- UNDP Bureau for Development Policy, 'Empowered and Equal: Gender Equality Strategy 2008-2011,' 2008.
- UNDP/Caribbean Community (CARICOM) Secretariat, 'Consultations on the Procedures and Systems on the Case in Support of the CSME' (no date).
- UNDP Department of Political Affairs, 'Draft Terms of Reference: Framework for Coordination of Interagency Collaboration in Support of Preventive Action and Peace and Development Advisors' (no date).
- UNDP El Salvador/Bureau for Development Policy, 'How to Prepare a Gender Strategy for a Country Office,' 2004.
- UNDP Evaluation Office, 'ADR Method Manual,' July 2009.
- UNDP Evaluation Office, 'Evaluation of the Role and Contribution of UNDP in Environment and Energy,' August 2008.
- UNDP/Global Environment Facility, 'Mid-term Evaluation of the Caribbean Renewable Energy Development Programme 2004-2008' (no date).
- UNDP/Global Environment Facility, 'Project Document: Caribbean Renewable Energy Development Programme,' April 2004.
- UNDP/Global Environment Facility, 'Report of the Final Project Evaluation Mission: GEF Assistance to the Iwokrama Rainforest Programme' (no date).
- UNDP/Global Environment Facility, 'Report on a Proposed Reformulation of CREDP,' May 2008.
- UNDP Guyana, 'Addendum to the EMPRETEC Guyana Project,' September 2002.
- UNDP Guyana, 'Annual Workplan 2006: Building Capacity for Gender Equity in Guyana.'
- UNDP Guyana, 'Annual Workplan 2009: Capacity Building and Piloting the Use of Renewable Energy in Rural Hinterland Communities.'
- UNDP Guyana, 'Annual Workplan 2009: Capacity Building for the Management of Natural Resources and the Environment.'
- UNDP Guyana, 'Annual Workplan 2009: Community Youth Governance Enhancement Programme.'
- UNDP Guyana, 'Annual Workplan 2009: Guyana Elections Commission.'
- UNDP Guyana, 'Annual Workplan 2009: National Capacity Self-Assessment Project.'
- UNDP Guyana, 'Annual Workplan 2009: National Working Group.'
- UNDP Guyana, 'Annual Workplan 2009: Terminal Phase-Out Management Plan.'

- UNDP Guyana, 'Can Fostering a Culture of Dialogue Change the Course of a Nation?: An Evaluation of the Social Cohesion Programme—Key Findings and Summary of Recommendations' (full report), August 2007.
- UNDP Guyana, 'Can Fostering a Culture of Dialogue Change the Course of a Nation?: Final Report of the Evaluation of the Social Cohesion Programme,' June 2007.
- UNDP Guyana, 'Country Office Workplan for Guyana 2008.'
- UNDP Guyana, 'Country programme document for Guyana (2006-2010),' October 2005.
- UNDP Guyana, 'Draft Project Document: Aid Effectiveness Support Plan' (no date).
- UNDP Guyana, 'Draft Project Document: Enhanced Budget Planning Support Plan' (no date).
- UNDP Guyana, 'Draft Project Document: MDG Support Plan' (no date).
- UNDP Guyana, 'Draft Project Evaluation Report: Building Local Capacity for the Management of Natural Resources and the Environment 2003-2007,' January 2008.
- UNDP, 'Extensions of country cooperation frameworks (including Guyana),' December 2003.
- UNDP Guyana, 'Final Report: EMPRETEC Guyana Project—Capacity Building to Foster Entrepreneurial Small and Medium Scale Enterprises and Regional Business Linkages, March 2003-August 2006,' August 2006.
- UNDP Guyana, 'Final Revised Report: EMPRETEC Evaluation,' March 2006.
- UNDP Guyana, 'Final Status Report on the Building Trust Fast Track Initiative: Reducing the Impact of the Violence and Crime—A Response to the Lusignan and Bartica Killings,' 2008.
- UNDP Guyana, 'Guyana Country Review Report on the First Country Cooperation Framework,' February 2001.
- UNDP Guyana, 'Intensifying the Use of the RBM Framework for Improved Development Assistance: Plan of Action for the Guyana Country Office,' April 2009.
- UNDP Guyana, 'Preparatory Assistance Document: Development of a Comprehensive Disaster Management Strategy in Guyana,' October 2002.
- UNDP Guyana, 'Project Cooperation Agreement between UNDP, Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Guyana Manufacturing Association for EMPRETEC Guyana,' September 2002.
- UNDP Guyana, 'Project Document: Benchmarks to Monitor and Evaluate Poverty Reduction Strategies' (no date).
- UNDP Guyana, 'Project Document: Capacity Building in Gender Equity in Governance' (no date).
- UNDP Guyana, 'Project Document: Ecological and Financial Sustainable Management of the Guiana Shield Eco-Region' (no date).
- UNDP Guyana, 'Project Document: Electoral Process Project,' 2008.
- UNDP Guyana, 'Project Document: EMPRETEC Guyana—Capacity-building Programme to Foster Entrepreneurial Small and Medium Scale Enterprises and Regional Business Linkages' (no date).
- UNDP Guyana, 'Project Document: Enhanced Public Trust, Security and Inclusion (EPTSI),' August 2008.
- UNDP Guyana, 'Project Document: Enhancing Inclusiveness, Sustainability and Effectiveness in Development Assistance Through Gender Mainstreaming,' July 2005.
- UNDP Guyana, 'Project Document: Reducing Vulnerability and Risk to Disasters—Implementation of the Comprehensive Disaster Management Strategy in Guyana 2003-2005' (no date).

- UNDP Guyana, 'Project Document: Strengthening National and Local Capacities for Disaster Response and Risk Reduction,' July 2009.
- UNDP Guyana, 'Project Document: Support to the Post Flood Recovery and Reconstruction Process in Guyana,' May 2005.
- UNDP Guyana, 'Project Document: UNDP-GEF Enabling Activities Project—Assessment of Capacity Building Needs, Preparation of Second and Third National Reports (CBD) and the Clearing House Mechanism' (no date).
- UNDP Guyana, 'Project Initiation Plan: Strengthening National and Local Capacities for Disaster Response and Risk Reduction,' 2008.
- UNDP Guyana, '2004 Results Report for Guyana.'
- UNDP Guyana, '2005 Results Report for Guyana.'
- UNDP Guyana, '2006 Results Report for Guyana.'
- UNDP Guyana, '2007 Results Report for Guyana.'
- UNDP Guyana, '2008 Results Oriented Annual Report for Guyana.'
- UNDP Guyana, 'Report on the Caribbean MDG Business Initiative 2005: Regional Workshop in Guyana,' June 2005.
- UNDP Guyana, 'Second Country Cooperation Framework for Guyana 2001-2003,' November 2001.
- UNDP Guyana, 'UNDP Guyana Resource Mobilization Strategy 2008-2010,' May 2008.
- UNDP Guyana/Government of Guyana, 'Project Document: Capacity Building and Demonstration Projects for Electrification of Hinterland and Underserved Areas, Utilising Renewable Energy' (no date).
- UNDP Guyana/Ministry of Amerindian Affairs, 'Project Document: Creating Economic Opportunities in the Hinterland Regions—Strengthening National Capacity for Income Generation and Poverty Eradication by Creating a Pilot Public/Private Partnership to Establish a Heart of Palm Plantation,' September 2002.
- UNDP Guyana/Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 'End Term Evaluation: EMPRETEC Project,' April 2006.
- UNDP Guyana/UNCT, 'Project Document: Strengthening Human-Rights Related UN Action,' 2006.
- UNDP Guyana/UNECLAC, 'Guyana: Socio-Economic Assessment of the Damages and Losses Caused by the January-February 2005 Flooding,' March 2005.
- UNDP HIV/AIDS Group, 'Essential Actions on Gender and AIDS,' 2008.
- United Nations Human Rights Council, 'Report of an Independent Expert on Minority Rights: Mission to Guyana,' August 2008.
- United Nations Office of the High Commission for Human Rights, 'End of Mission Report, Human Rights Advisor Guyana 2007-2008,' June 2008.
- World Bank, 'A Time to Choose: Caribbean Development in the 21st Century,' April 2005.
- World Bank, 'International Development Association Country Assistance Strategy for Guyana, FY 2009-2012,' April 2009.
- World Bank, 'Memorandum and Recommendation of the President of the IDA to the Executive Directors on Assistance to the Cooperative Republic of Guyana under the Enhanced HIPC Debt Initiative,' November 2003.
- World Bank Group, 'Country Assistance Strategy of the World Bank Group for the Cooperative Republic of Guyana,' May 2002.

WEBSITES

(Note: all websites were accessed at least once between May 1st and September 14th, 2009)

- Bank of Guyana, <http://www.bankofguyana.org.gy/>
- BBC News Guyana country profile, http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/americas/country_profiles/1211325.stm
- Caribbean Development Bank Guyana profile, <http://www.caribank.org/titanweb/cdb/webcms.nsf/AllDoc/6AB2CC8E599FC5CE87257338006919C4?OpenDocument>
- Central Intelligence Agency World Factbook Guyana profile, <https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/geos/gu.html>
- CIDA Caribbean Regional Programme, <http://www.acdi-cida.gc.ca/acdi-cida/ACDI-CIDA.nsf/Eng/JUD-327123545-NMX>
- DFID, <http://www.dfid.gov.uk/where-we-work/caribbean/guyana1/>
- European Commission, http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/where/acp/country-cooperation/guyana/guyana_en.htm
- Guyana Bureau of Statistics, <http://www.statisticsguyana.gov.gy/>
- Global Environment Facility Guyana Country profile, <http://www.gefonline.org/Country/CountryDetails.cfm>
- Guyana Elections Commission, <http://www.gecom.org.gy/>
- Inter-American Development Bank (general information on its Guyana programme), http://www.iadb.org/countries/home.cfm?id_country=GY&language=English
- Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (aid statistics for Guyana), <http://www.oecd.org/dac/stats/>
- United Nations Collaborative Programme on Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation in Developing Countries (UN-REDD), <http://www.un-redd.org/>
- United Nations Commission on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) background on EMPRETEC, http://www.unctadxi.org/templates/Startpage___7428.aspx
- UNDP Guyana Country Programme, <http://www.undp.org.gy/>
- United Nations Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean, <http://www.eclac.org/>
- United Nations Volunteers (UNV), <http://www.unv.org/>
- USAID Guyana country profile, http://www.usaid.gov/locations/latin_america_caribbean/country/guyana/index.html
- World Bank Group Guyana country brief, <http://www.worldbank.org/WBSITE/EXTERNAL/COUNTRIES/LACEXT/EXTGUYANA/0,,contentMDK:20220611~pagePK:141137~piPK:141127~theSitePK:6320636,00.html>
- World Bank Group information on aid-per-capita, http://ddp-ext.worldbank.org/ext/ddpreports/ViewSharedReport?REPORT_ID=13164&REQUEST_TYPE=VIEW



United Nations Development Programme
Evaluation Office
One United Nations Plaza
New York, NY 10017, USA
Tel. (212) 906 5059, Fax (212) 906 6008
Internet: <http://www.undp.org/evaluation>

